



Made in India
First Published 1991

STORY OF THE CIVILISATION

© COSMO PUBLICATIONS

Published Under Agreement with
the Original Publisher.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Published by :

RANI KAPOOR (MRS.)
COSMO PUBLICATIONS
For GENESIS PUBLISHING PVT. LTD.
24-B, Ansari Road, Daryaganj,
New Delhi-110 002

Printed at
MEHRA OFFSET PRESS, DELHI.

STORY OF THE CIVILISATION

WRITTEN BY THE FOREMOST HISTORIANS
OF OUR TIME AND ILLUSTRATED WITH
UPWARDS OF 8,000 PICTURES

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

A. D. INNES, M.A. • ARTHUR ME
J. A. HAMMERTON

NEW AND REVISED EDITION
IN FIFTEEN VOLUMES

VOLUME VIII

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH
AND EASTERN EUROPE TO
THE FRENCH REVOLUTION




COSMO PUBLICATIONS

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VIII.

SIXTH GRAND DIVISION

EUROPE

	PAGE		PAGE
FIRST DIVISION (continued)		THE SOUTHERN SLAVS	
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH		The Southern Slav Peoples	3069
The Dawn of the New Day	2837	Croatia and its Warrior Race	3083
The Apostolic Era	2847	The Servian Era of Independence	3089
The Spread of Christianity	2857	Under the Heel of the Turk	3097
The Catholic Church in Being	2867	THE STORY OF THE GIPSIES	3104
The Church Established	2881	HUNGARY	
SECOND DIVISION		The Magyars in the Middle Ages	3113
EASTERN EUROPE TO THE		The Hapsburg Power in Hungary	3125
FRENCH REVOLUTION		German Element in Hungary	3135
General Survey of the Period	2895	THE WESTERN SLAVS	
BYZANTIUM		Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia	3145
Rise of the Byzantine Empire	2907	Bohemia and the Reformation	3159
Civilisation of the Early Byzantine		Bohemia's Elective Monarchy	3173
Empire	2919	Funeral Pyre of Slav Chieftain, facing	3181
The Days of the Icon-Breakers	2935	ORIGIN OF THE EASTERN SLAVS	3181
Byzantium at its height	2947	POLAND	
Byzantium on the Down Grade	2957	The Old Polish Empire	3193
Fall of the Byzantine Empire	2963	Lithuania to the Union with Poland	3211
The End of Byzantium	2970	Union of Lithuania with Poland	3221
OTTOMAN EMPIRE		The New Dominion of Poland	3229
The Rise of Ottoman Power	2977	Poland Under the Jagellons	3241
The Ottoman Conquest of Byzantium	2985	The Decline of Poland	3255
Life in a Turkish Harem, plate facing	2995	The Great Days of Cossack Power	3263
The Shining of the Crescent	2995	The Fall of Poland	3278
The Waning of the Crescent	3009	Thaddeus Reyten at the Diet of	
ARMENIA AND THE ARMENIANS	3024	Warsaw facing	3283
THE HUNS	3027	RUSSIA	
THE BULGARIANS		The Beginning of the Russian Nation	3285
The Old Bulgarian Kingdom	3033	Russia Under the Mongols	3305
The Later Bulgarian Kingdom	3042	The Monarchs of Moscow	3315
THE ROUMANIANS		Peter the Great, Founder of Modern	
The Struggles of the Wallachian		Russia	3331
Kingdom	3051	When Women Ruled in Russia	3345
The Moldavian People	3059	Rise of the Kingdom of Russia	3357
THE ALBANIANS	3064	Great Dates in History of Eastern	
		Europe	3355
		HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF	
		THE BALTIC	3361



THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

THE DAWN OF THE NEW DAY

HOW CHRISTIANITY CHANGED THE WORLD

CÆSAR AUGUSTUS organised, on the foundations laid by his adoptive father, the mightiest political power that the world had known. And in his days there went forth a "decree that all the world should be taxed," and so it befell that the Child Jesus was born and laid in a manger in Bethlehem of Judæa. Incarnate in the Babe was the spiritual force, mightier than that of Rome itself, which conquered the west, penetrating those peoples in whose hands lay the destinies of mankind from that time forth. Of high lineage but low estate, the Child grew up "in the favour of God and man." Only one story of His boyhood is preserved; until suddenly, being nearly thirty years old, He was hailed by John the Baptist, the last prophet of the Hebrews, as the Messiah, the fore-ordained Saviour of the race.

For three years He moved among men, revealing the new doctrine of salvation, of the Kingdom of God realised through the Christ. To the learned classes of the Jews and to the priesthood the new doctrines were anathema, for they brushed aside the formulæ of scholastic pedantry and the authority of those who claimed to be the interpreters of the law; it was easy to condemn them as monstrous blasphemies. To the populace they were confused, by a material literalism, with dreams of a restored Jewish monarchy. The personality of the Teacher inspired on the one side bitter animosity, on the other intense devotion. To the devotees, the whole world seemed to reel when the Saviour sent by God was crucified by the order of the Roman procurator. Again,

in a moment all was changed; the rumour flew among His followers that the crucified Christ was risen from the dead. He had been seen by and had spoken with those who could not be mistaken; not two or three only, but hundreds could bear their testimony. As joy took the place of mourning, the misinterpreted riddle of

**A Religion
to Move
Worlds**

Christ's teaching found a new, a tremendous, a triumphant meaning. Material misconceptions were overwhelmed in a spiritual illumination. Faith in the Christ became a religion, momentous, to move worlds; a religion resting on a newly-discovered personal relation between the believer and the God who made him, whose name is Love; awful, mysterious, but unspeakably blessed.

The religion of Christ came into a world where there was no religion, but countless cults. Religion as a vital moving force had no existence. The wise found their consolations for the troubles of life in philosophies which satisfied their intellectual cravings; vulgar intelligences could pick and choose among innumerable superstitions; the state could deify itself and impose upon the world the formal recognition of an authorised pantheon. In none of these was there the renovating spiritual force which could do battle with an enervating materialism, the more enervating because of its unconsciousness of its own needs. The necessary idealism, though it might take perverted and distorted forms, was to find its source in the faith of the crucified Christ.

Without entering upon the labyrinths of theological controversy, or offering a

condensed substitute for the narratives of the evangelists, there are aspects of the ministry and teaching of Jesus which cannot be passed over in a historical survey which includes Christianity in its purview as a world-force. For three

**Jesus
and His
Disciples**

years Jesus preached throughout the land of Judæa that "the kingdom of Heaven was come." He devoted special instruction to those Jews who had resolved never to leave Him again. These "twelve" were some day to continue his work. What new thing did He intend to teach? What did He mean by saying that with Him the kingdom of God was

of the race of Abraham, which made it possible to be excluded from eternal salvation. If such errors were refuted, it was only to clear away obstacles to the reception of the absolutely new teaching given by Him.

"No man cometh to the Father, but by Me." That is the claim which He asserts. He will not adduce new ideas. He wishes rather to place men in such a position towards the God who is objectively present that they may hold Him actually as a father. That which every religious craving, however unconscious, strives for at bottom, and by which it can be completely satisfied, He wishes to




THE CHILD JESUS IN THE HOUSE OF JOSEPH AND MARY AT BETHLEHEM

From the painting by Sir John Everett Millais, P.R.A.

present on earth? In order to settle this point rightly, we must not overlook the fact that very much of that which He taught was intended to be, one may say, elementary instruction, and was only spoken on account of the special needs of His chance hearers. Thus many of His sayings are directed against a distortion or disregard of such truths as were already to be found in the sacred writings of the Jews, against the Pharisaical transformation of the law as the will of God into a number of separate ordinances, the outward observance of which was effectual in gaining the approbation of God. He spoke against pride in the mere outward membership

give, and this He says He can give. "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Does anyone seek rest from the accusations of his conscience? "I am the way" to this. Does anyone seek certainty of belief? "I am the truth." Does anyone seek a real life, raised above all that is miserable and transitory? "I am the life." He thus intensifies the idea of the "kingdom of God," which, according to the national hope of his people, the promised King, the Messiah, was to found, and declares Himself to be the Mediator of that Kingdom of God.

**Teaching
of
Christ**



THE FINDING OF THE SAVIOUR IN THE TEMPLE
From the painting by William Holman Hunt, by permission of the Corporation of Birmingham.

But to have God as father and thus to stand in the kingdom of heaven is for man a thing important beyond everything else. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Compared with this relation to God, the relation to the nearest human being must take a secondary place. "He that loveth father or mother," son or daughter, "more than Me is not worthy of Me," not worthy of that which I alone can give. And whoever has found this highest thing, must completely change his valuation of everything else. He would rather cut his hand off, pluck out his eye than give up that possession; he is ready "to lose his life for My sake," in order not to lose Me, through whom he has it.

But it is man as man who shall stand in this kingdom of God: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever should believe on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life!" The distinction between Jew and heathen, then, loses its meaning: "They shall come from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, and shall sit at meat in the kingdom of God." Thus all who possess in common this **God's Gift to Man** "pearl of great price" are by this most closely bound together: "One fold under one shepherd." So it cannot be immaterial to them that all men have not yet found that which brought peace to their own souls. They shall "testify" of Jesus, let their "light shine before men," and "make all nations disciples of Jesus." From the love of God proceeds naturally the love of mankind: "The second is like unto the first." Finally, whoever lives in communion with the eternal God has thereby the pledge of eternal life. "For God is not a God of the dead, but of the living." And if the actual state of things in this world seems to contradict the claim which Jesus maintains, as well as the high honour promised to His disciples, yet the "kingdom of God will" one day "come in majesty." Jesus will separate the "godless" from the "just," and the latter, clothed with a new body, will "inherit the kingdom prepared for them since the foundation of the world."

From that community between God and man which Jesus desired to establish there sprang, therefore, thoughts which at that time had already taken life in

the heathen world, the conceptions of the one God, of humanity, of the importance of the individual, of the justification for the desire after happiness, of the better world to come, of sin, and of purification. Jesus did not announce these as mere ideas, but as realities, which partly exist, even if they are not acknowledged, partly will exist, even if they are not desired:



A GREAT ITALIAN'S PICTURE OF CHRIST
When the art of Venice was flourishing, none excelled Giovanni Bellini in the tender grace and spiritual beauty of his pictures of Christ, as in this fine conception.

and as an actual fact, which "belief"—that is, the trustful surrender to Him, proves to be real: "My teaching is from Him Who sent me. If anyone will do His will, he will know if this teaching be from God." "Whoever believes on Me, he hath eternal life." Religion, consequently, is raised above human choice and human

CHRISTIANITY—THE DAWN OF THE NEW DAY

ordinance. State religion is a denial of the true religion; and this is the meaning of the saying, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Religion is a matter of the conscience. It is the immediate relation of the individual towards God; yet such a relation that its goal, the communion with God, is, in fact, only

many had known neither Him nor His Father; but that no hostility would be able to check the growth of the kingdom of Heaven brought by Him. The small grain of seed was to become a mighty tree. The little leaven was to penetrate all, the whole world and all conditions of things.

Those Jews who surrendered themselves to his influence found in Him that which they had sought. "Master, Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and known that Thou art Christ, the son of the living God." But the more distinctly Jesus let it appear that He wished to be recognised as the Messiah, and the larger the number of those who, full of confidence, hailed Him with joy, the higher rose the hostility of those in power among the people. This hostility reached its culminating point when Jesus on the first day of the week in which the Easter feast began made a striking and solemn entry into the capital. He thought that He had preached long enough, and that by word and deed He had fully corrected that misunderstanding

The Entry into Jerusalem of the claim raised by Him, as if He wished for earthly honour; now He might bring matters to a decision. Whoever was not with Him was against Him. What must be, was now to happen. The leaders of the people resolved on His destruction.

He did not withdraw from the gathering storm. He gave Himself into the hands of His enemies. Both by silence and by speech He brought on the end. The Sanhedrin pronounced sentence of death on Him, because He "blasphemed God" by the profane declaration that He was "Christ, the Son of the living God." The Roman procurator, Pontius Pilate, recognised that the accusation that Jesus had given himself out as a king was based on a misinterpretation of His words. But at the pressing persistence of the Jews he allowed at last the death sentence to be carried out, in order to be secure against the slanderous report at Rome that he had not sufficiently guarded the sovereign rights of the emperor. Jesus, hanging on the cross, prayed God to forgive His murderers, and assured the criminal crucified at His side, who in consciousness of his debt of sin turned in trust to Christ, that he would enter into everlasting bliss. And when he had overcome the deepest spiritual pang, the feeling of being forsaken




"THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD"

Among modern conceptions of Christ none is better known than Holman Hunt's. It has been the subject of great controversy, and is given here purely as a work of art.

reached through Jesus. The assertion of this claim by Him, who bore no signs of external rank, tended to rouse many to sharp contradiction. As He said of Himself He was "come to stir up men against each other," so He foretold to those who were ready to labour for Him that they would be hated and persecuted, because



CHRIST BEFORE PILATE
Reproduced from a photograph by Messrs Braun, Clement & Cie of the painting by Munkacsy



"ECCE HOMO - BEHOLD THE MAN!"
From the painting by Verelsteden, 1630, Gallery of Modern Art, Rome

by God, He declared when dying that His work was "done," and commended His spirit into His Father's hands.

In vain had Jesus tried to prepare His disciples for His death, and had represented it as His free act and as necessary for the "reconciliation of many." The hopes which they placed in Him were still so deeply tinged with national expectations that they had come to understand such statements figuratively. His death thus perplexed them in every way. He had so completely identified their religious belief with His own person that this belief could no longer exist when He, on whom they trusted, was given up to death. One feeling only mastered them, fear—fear lest the same fate might be brought on them by their enemies.

Seven weeks later, when the Jewish feast of Pentecost is being celebrated, we see them completely transformed. Not a faint trace of human fear, nothing of doubt or uncertainty. The belief which Jesus' death had destroyed lives again in them with a certain inner conviction until now unknown, and with an almost alarming recklessness, that finds expression in the bold confession of their faith. In that same Jerusalem which had shouted round Jesus, "Away with Him, crucify Him!" they were now able publicly to preach before thousands "Jesus of Nazareth, the Man of God, you have with wicked hands nailed to the Cross and slain. Him hath God raised up. Of this we all are witnesses. So now let the whole people of Israel know certainly that God hath made this Jesus Lord and Messiah."

The possibility of doubt in Christ's resurrection is so entirely excluded from their thoughts that even before the Sanhedrin, and after they had been forced to suffer imprisonment and scourging for this declaration, they unflinchingly hold fast to their belief, "We cannot but speak what we have heard and seen." The four Gospels and the Apostle Paul (I Corinthians, 15) suggest to us what effected this tremendous revulsion in the feelings of the disciples when they tell us that Jesus during the first weeks after Eastertide appeared constantly, sometimes to his disciples singly, sometimes to many together, and, as it were, forced them, who expected anything rather than His resurrection, to the belief that He had

not remained in the grave, and demonstrated to them the necessity of His death and of His resurrection, assuring them at the same time that even in the future He would "be with them even unto the end of the world." This conviction determines henceforth their whole life.

By preaching to the people they achieved important results. In a short time the number of those men only who let themselves be "baptised in Christ for the remission of sins" reached some 5,000. The feeling of the people was so favourable to this new religious community that the Sanhedrin did not yet venture to do more than to threaten and scourge some of the preachers. Men agreed with the counsel of the much-respected teacher, Gamaliel, to wait quietly for further developments.

What a picture is presented by this first Christian community when we remember how Jesus had exalted the value of belief in Him. Incontestably an unshaken certainty of religious trust filled these Christians. Neither the harsh contradiction of those who from education and position in life might have been the first to learn the truth was able to make them waver, nor could the threats and the punishments, announcing still heavier penalties, on the part of the Sanhedrin, reduce them even to silence. Hard though it was for them to resist the distinct command of the leaders of their nation, yet they could only put the question to them: "Judge yourselves if it be right before God that we hearken unto you more than unto God!"

For them religion had become a direct intercourse of the individual with God, into which no other man might intrude. They no longer recognised a religion of state or nation. Independent personal belief took the place of state belief; but the basis of their religious conviction is the consciousness of that which they possess in faith, the certainty that they have received "forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost"; and, therefore, also that one day they should be refreshed by the vision of the face of God. They feel themselves so happy in this possession that "joy" is mentioned as the keynote of their spirit, which, on the one side, expresses itself in a continually new "lauding and praising of God"; on the other side, makes it impossible for them to conceal the great gift they have

CHRISTIANITY—THE DAWN OF THE NEW DAY

acquired. And in their joy at that which they all possess in common they feel themselves as "one heart and one soul," and that so sincerely that no one of them regards his material possessions as his own. Not, indeed, that those who enter into their community are required or expected to renounce personal possessions, but the

their circle. Jews by birth, they still feel themselves members of their nation. They continue to live according to the forms of their ancestral law, take part still, as before, in the religious meetings in the Temple and in the synagogues. We notice no trace here of that overstrained piety which is intended to conceal from the




THE DESCENT FROM THE CROSS
From the painting by Rubens.

brotherly love which animates all makes them devote their goods for others also "so far as there was need," in order that "no man might want."

And yet this intimate union and close co-operation of the early Christians among themselves did not lead them to erect barriers against those who stood outside

man's own consciousness the want of a real fund of piety in the soul. There is, indeed, joyful enthusiasm but no religious extravagance or fanaticism. They cannot refrain from boldly confessing their belief, but as yet they are far removed from the enthusiastic desire of conquering the world.



THE ENTRY OF CHRIST INTO JERUSALEM

This painting, by H. C. Selous, gives a carefully studied restoration of the general aspect of the city at the time of Christ.



THE APOSTOLIC ERA

THE TEACHING OF THE DISCIPLES

AND THE LIFE AND WORK OF THE APOSTLE PAUL

THE acceptance of Christianity as an evangel for Jews alone—of Christ as the Messiah, the Redeemer of the "Chosen People" according to the flesh—would have left the world undisturbed. The Gospel of Christ, the Redeemer of mankind, gradually assumed the supreme position as an influence modifying every political and social conception in the development of European civilisation. It is in this light, and not as a theology, that we have to treat of it in these pages.

The merit, however, of having definitely conceived and preached Christianity as a world-religion belongs primarily to Saul, of Tarsus in Cilicia; otherwise, St. Paul the apostle. He had been introduced to a profound study of the Jewish law by the renowned rabbi, Gamaliel, and had given himself up to it with the fullest enthusiasm. Nevertheless, he was not without some tincture of Greek culture. A man cast in

**Paul the
First Great
Preacher**

one mould, with nothing false, nothing incomplete in him, he had been kindled by that which he had learnt of Jesus and his followers into flaming zeal for the maintenance of the sacred ancestral law as the only path to salvation.

Stephen's death and the flight of the Christians from Jerusalem did not content him. Armed with letters of introduction from the Sanhedrin, he started for Damascus, in order to track out the Christians who had escaped thither and to lead them, fettered, to Jerusalem. But the Christians in Damascus learnt the incredible news that he had caused himself to be received into their community through baptism in the name of Christ. What had so completely transformed him on the way he often told in the words: "The Lord Jesus appeared to me." This marvellous experience had forged and stamped his new religious conceptions. He was then convinced that He whom he had hated and opposed bitterly was not rejected of

God, but was exalted to eternal glory. In what blindness had he then lived, what a burden of sin was on him! Notwithstanding his perfect observance of the law, nothing else but condemnation would have lighted on him. He was called

**The Grace
of Christ
to Paul**

back from his path of error and saved, owing to Him whom he had persecuted. Jesus met him, not with avenging wrath, but with mercy. From that time he praised the majesty of Jesus as the Saviour. Thus the doctrines of sin and of grace become the cardinal points of his preaching. And as all men are sinners, the grace of God in Christ extends over all mankind, over the Gentiles as much as over the Jews.

Paul devoted several years to gathering and assimilating the elements of his new religious conviction. For it is necessary for him to put before himself in all its logical consequences that which has become certain to him directly by faith, in order that he may recognise it as "divine wisdom." Then begins his incomparably great activity, in the extension of the belief in which he has found salvation. With unspeakable toil he lays in ten years the foundations of the Church in Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece. He seeks to strengthen by epistles the communities founded by him and to shield them from errors. On his second missionary journey, which leads him over Asia Minor, through Macedonia, into Greece, he sends from Corinth his two epistles

**Epistles
to the
Thessalonians**

to the community recently established in Thessalonica; on the third journey he makes a longer stay in cosmopolitan Ephesus, and from there writes to the Christians assembled in Galatia and his first epistle to Corinth; writing a second also when, on his way to Corinth, he has reached Macedonia. From Greece his glance is directed further towards the

west. At Rome a Christian community has already arisen, we do not know in what way. In the hope of preaching his gospel of salvation at Rome, in the centre of the "world," he addresses an epistle to the Christians, in order to prepare them for his arrival. He is to go there, but in fetters. In Jerusalem he is recognised by Jews from Asia Minor. They rouse the mass of the people by their cry that

Philemon, the Colossians, Philippians, and Ephesians. Recently there has been a tendency to accept the view that he once more obtained his freedom and was able to carry out his wish to bear testimony to Christ as far as the Atlantic and Spain. If this is really the case, the journeys of which the two epistles to Timothy and to Titus speak would have to be assigned to that date.

It may be considered as fairly well established that by the orders of Nero at Rome his noble head fell beneath the sword of the executioner.

The hardest struggle of his life was concerned with setting Christianity free from the leading strings of Judaism. How could Christians who were Jews by birth immediately assent to his demand, so clearly and emphatically asserted, that in the presence of Christianity the wall between Jew and Gentile must be destroyed? For them it was a natural thing that even after their baptism they should continue to observe the law of their fathers. But that law prescribed the strictest separation from all Gentiles. It was only a preliminary and insufficient concession when Paul—at the so-called apostolic council at Jerusalem—succeeded in inducing the leaders and the majority of the community there to admit that the Gentile Christians were not bound to the observance of the Jewish law. All Christians were not "one fold under



THE CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL

The great merit of first preaching Christianity as a splendidly conceived world-religion belongs to Paul, who, from being a persecutor of the Christians, became the most ardent apostle of the new faith, for which he was eventually martyred.

"this is the fellow who instructs men everywhere against the law and the Temple." The Roman tribune saves him from the fanaticism of the mob by arresting him and sending him to Cæsarea. Kept a prisoner without reason, he avails himself of the right of a Roman citizen to appeal to Cæsar, and he is taken to Rome. From that period of his mild imprisonment are dated his epistles to

one shepherd" until the Jewish Christians also abandoned their law.

This was a principle so bold that even the energy of a Paul could establish it only in the communities which he himself had founded, and there only after the greatest waverings and the most bitter struggles. For the Jewish Christians once more tried to persuade the Gentile Christians that without circumcision and the observance



"Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, 'To the Unknown God.' 'What ye therefore worship, Him declare I am saying.' Acts xiv. 15-17.



When Paul and Barnabas were at Lystra, a cripple was healed through faith in their teaching, whereupon the people were ready to believe the apostles gods come to earth, and the priest of Jupiter brought forth an ox to offer a sacrifice; but Paul and Barnabas rent their clothes, crying out, "Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you." Acts xiv. 8-15.

SCENES FROM THE GREAT MISSIONARY VISITS OF ST. PAUL

After paintings by Raphael

of the Mosaic law they could not be saved. These disputes caused Paul to cast his "Gospel" into a form which excluded every distinctively Jewish feature. In contrast to those who, through observance of the Jewish law, thought to please God,

The Gospel According to St. Paul he defended with all his energy the proposition that no observance of the law in itself—in fact, no outward act of man at all—had any value in God's sight; that before God the attitude of children, childlike trust, and "faith," were far more necessary, and that from this relation of man to God true morality followed necessarily: "By faith, without works of the law, we are righteous."

The separation from Judaism, which Paul had demanded, was greatly helped by two events. The Christians of Jerusalem could not but see that even the strictest obedience to the law on their side could not cure their countrymen of their hatred of Christ. The head of the community, James, the brother of Jesus, bore the surname of the "Just," because his strictness in observing the law and his asceticism were universally admired. The epistle in the New Testament which bears his name is full of exhortations of obedience towards the law; and yet his countrymen hurled him down from the pinnacle of the Temple because he had praised Jesus.

How could the Christians any longer hold fast to the hope that the Jewish people as a whole would still believe in Jesus! How much more easy for them was the separation, now that the terrible struggle of their nation against the Romans blazed up! Should they take up arms for the national freedom, in order to be persecuted in return by their own people? The Christian community abandoned the city when it was threatened with complete investment by the Romans. If—as is conjectured—some Christians re-

mained behind to share the fortunes of their nation, they were the elements which had ever hindered an amalgamation with the Gentile Christians. The burning of Jerusalem and its Temple must have given the death-blow to national restriction on Christianity.

This catastrophe drove the apostles at the same time from the centre of their present activity into far distant lands. One, Andrew, is said to have turned towards the north-east and to have spread the Christian faith in Scythia, north-east of the Black Sea, and the Caspian. A second, Thomas, selected, as it is said, the countries between the Euphrates and the Indus for his sphere of work; at the present day a Christian society in

India call themselves "Christians of St. Thomas" after him. We are likewise told of a third, Bartholomew, who preached in India. Others turned their steps to the interior of Asia Minor or to North Africa. The Christian community in Alexandria traced its foundation to John Mark, the companion of Paul and Peter, and the writer of the second Gospel. Peter seems to have laboured in Syria and Asia Minor (we have an epistle from him to the Christians of Asia Minor) and finally to have turned



SAINT MATTHEW
From the painting by Rubens.

his steps to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom.

Only one figure rises in sharp relief out of the mists of tradition, that of the apostle John. After the imprisonment of Paul the communities founded by him in Asia Minor were left desolate. John entered on Paul's work, labouring in wide circles from Ephesus. The spirit which animated him is characterised by the tradition that when brought in extreme old age into the Christian assembly, he contented himself with the admonition, "Little children, love one another!" Yet this love of his was anything but

St. John and the Gospel of Love



SPAGNOLETTO'S CONCEPTION OF THE APOSTLE PETER



THE MIRACULOUS DELIVERANCE OF ST. PETER IN ROME

From the painting by Spagnoletto (Kibera) in the Prado Gallery at Madrid

effeminate, as later tradition represented it. On the contrary, he was sure that fervent love among the Christians was possible only so long as the truth was not distorted among them. Once—so the story runs—as he entered a bath he learnt that the false teacher Cerinthus was there. "Away from here," he cried to his companions, "that the bath may not fall in on us, since Cerinthus, the foe of truth, is there." The feeling of bitter indignation at the "spirit of lying," which was then creeping into Christian communities, speaks in his epistles. His Gospel also follows the line of confuting misstatements and proving that "Jesus is the Christ," who is come into the world, and that "through faith in His name we have life." The Apocalypse, which he is said to have written while an exile on the island of Patmos in the Ægean Sea, vigorously attacks all indifference to false doctrines. Thus, quite at the close of the apostolic era we meet those tendencies towards the distortion of original Christianity which were destined in the ensuing period to jeopardise its existence.

What was the constitution of the original community? We find, on the one hand, no eagerness for organisation; on the other hand, fundamental aversion to it. Questions of organisation were clearly far removed from these Christians. This

was not because they hoped, at any rate in the early days, to win their whole nation to their faith, in which case an independent, permanent organisation

seemed unnecessary, or because they expected the immediate end of the world, and thus thought it unnecessary to secure the permanence of their society by the introduction of legal forms; but chiefly because the fuiness of life and a strong social spirit filled them all, and because they knew that their continued existence was guaranteed by their Lord, who, though invisible, was ever near. Naturally the apostles took a leading position, but this "office" was regarded as a "service." And when more rights, or, properly speaking, more opportunities for rendering service, were given them than they could exercise usefully, they caused certain men to be chosen out of the community, who relieved them of the care of the poor: the "Seven," as they were first called in contradistinction to the "Twelve" apostles, the "Elders" (presbyters), as they seem to have been designated later, when their number became greater with the growing community. But it did not occur to the apostles to reserve to themselves the superintendence

over this society, as if its powers emanated from their supreme authority, nor did the community claim a right



THE APOSTLE PAUL
From the painting by Rubens



SAINT MARK
From the painting by Fra Bartolomeo.

THE APOSTOLIC ERA

of electing its officers, nor do we even notice anywhere any aversion from the creation of a new office. New conditions and apparent needs caused new offices to be formed, and no extravagant feeling, which would wish to leave everything to freedom and to the impulse of the spirit, opposed this better arrangement. But when the apostles had no longer any permanent abode in Jerusalem, we see another man at the head of the community: the brother of Jesus, already mentioned, James. Yet we cannot ascertain how far his authority was limited; evidently it was not closely limited, being a service of love shown to the community. After his death it is another kinsman of Jesus, Simeon by name, who stands serving at their head. Together with the one

intended sense of the word by which the importance of the chief office was expressed—"episcopus." As the Christians called Jesus "the shepherd and bishop of their souls," so also they called the men who, like Him, cared for the flock. The meaning

The Origin of Bishops to be conveyed was not that of overseers, but of guardians. "Not as those who rule the people" were they called shepherds, but because they fed the flock, provided it with nourishment, and guarded it from wolves. We soon come across still another office, that of the "servants," deacons. They performed special commissions or services, which the bishops pointed out to them.

This, then, was the organisation—if we may speak of it as such—of the separate



SAINT MARK PREACHING AT ALEXANDRIA, WHERE HE FOUNDED A CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY
A famous painting by Giovanni Bellini, now in the Brera Gallery at Milan

"leader," the elders seem to have attended to the external affairs of the community.

The development was somewhat different in the communities composed principally of Gentiles. Here Paul instituted elders. Not, however, at once, as if such an office were necessary in itself; it was only on the return journey from his first missionary tour that he determined to do so. The need for some single administrative body had soon shown itself. It is not told us whether he himself nominated these men or whether he left the election of them to the community. Such questions of jealousy and distrust still lay far from those Christians. They recognised only duties in the service of the brethren, but no rights. This was the

Paul Institutes the Elders

communities; in the original community a leader and with him a number of presbyters entrusted with separate tasks; in the Gentile Christian communities a college of presbyters, or "bishops," at the head, with the deacons to aid them.

What, then, was the relation of these different communities to each other? Did they stand independently side by side, or did they legally form a united whole? Neither one nor the other. The separate communities neither sought anxiously to preserve their absolute independence, nor did they wish to compel a united organisation. They *felt* themselves to be a unity, and, therefore, tried to create and to preserve ties among themselves, to smooth or abolish distinctions. As soon as communities were formed outside Jerusalem,

the apostles felt that they had obligations towards them. Two of them went to Samaria, in order to minister to the Christians there. Barnabas was sent to Antioch, in order to "strengthen" those who had been baptised into Christianity. In every imaginable way Paul tried to establish the fact that all Christians formed a

The Oneness of the Christian Community

single aggregate. He greeted the one community from the other, sent salutations from individuals to individuals at a distance. He made the communities exchange among themselves the letters they had received from him. One community sent support to him while he laboured in another. He organised a fund among the Christians converted by him on behalf of the distressed Christians of Palestine. Even in outward relations he tried to establish equality among all believers, and based such arrangements on the argument that other communities observed them. But the violent dispute over the necessity of observing the law established the fact that all baptised in Jesus were one. The different attitudes with regard to this question would destroy this unity, hence the struggles to find a compromise. But there was not yet any need to represent this unity in any systematic form. As long as apostles lived, they were the outward bond of the Church.

The common religious life in this first period bore the same character. Here, again, there was nothing of legal precept and fixed ordinance. The Christians of Jerusalem still took a zealous part in the religious life of their nation. But withal there was the need to emphasise and to promote that which was common to them, and which differentiated them from those who did not believe in Jesus. They assembled in the houses, in order "to remain in the teaching of the apostles," to pray in common, to testify to the

The Holy Eucharist

close bonds of union between themselves by partaking of common meals, and to celebrate the Eucharist in remembrance of Him.

In the communities composed principally of Gentiles two sorts of religious services were soon distinguishable. The one class, intended only for the brethren, comprised the agapé, or love-feast, and the celebration of the Lord's Supper; the other, to which those also who had not

yet received baptism were admitted, served for the preaching of their faith. If Paul was the leader of the assembly, he naturally was the speaker. If he was not there, an extract from the Old Testament or from letters written by Paul was read, or some other person stepped forward who felt moved to speak. One spoke as "prophet" on the strength of a revelation; another, as "teacher," explained what the present or former revelation connoted; a third "exhorted," while he applied the word of God to individuals by name.

Not only in comparison with the apostles, who were equipped with this threefold gift, but also in comparison with the members of the community to whom one of these gifts was granted the elders (or bishops) at first were quite subordinated in the religious service. But soon, in certain places at least, were seen the dangers of a procedure so exposed to caprice. The excitable Greek spirit allowed religious enthusiasm to express itself in forms, which did not tend towards the "edification" of the meeting, and vanity and self-complacency could easily lead to intemperance of speech. To meet

such a state of affairs in the Corinthian Church, Paul had to lay down the principle that all gifts are bestowed for the "common good," and that all speech, therefore, which did not seem to edify those present, must be discontinued. There appeared, then, quite soon, in the celebration of the divine service a limitation on the rightful liberty of the individual.

As the number of the Christians increased and the expectation of the approaching end of the world lessened, the religious zeal of the earliest period yielded to a more restrained calmness, and the gift of prophecy was more rarely seen. Therefore, in the choice of new bishops the condition was laid down that they must possess the gift of teaching, in order that the communities might not, when none of the old apostles were any longer among them, be dependent in their religious meetings merely upon "prophets" and "teachers." Thus, it also happened that while at first the Christians assembled daily, if possible, gradually a definite day of the week was reserved for meeting for divine worship. Even in apostolic times this was the "Lord's Day," the first day of the week, on which the Lord rose from the dead.

THE APOSTOLIC ERA

In order to form a correct conception of the moral conditions prevalent in the Gentile Christian communities, we must not fail to notice that the high demands which the writings of Jesus' disciples, so well known to us, make upon their readers do not at all reflect the opinions of Christianity at that date, but only the ideas of those who had grown up in the purer atmosphere of Judaism. On the contrary, not only do we come upon instances of gross offences against morality, but especially the warnings and admonitions given by Paul in his epistles as to what was necessary for "salvation" show how completely the moral bias of the Christians was as yet under the influence of the conditions and ideas which prevailed in the Gentile world.


That there must be another standard of morality than custom, and that every Christian with regard to this question must acquire a completely independent judgment and maintain it and follow it in opposition to a world which judges quite otherwise—to inculcate this and to accustom the Christians to the permanent realisation of these new moral notions, must have required tens, if not hundreds, of years. A man announced the desire for regenerated life only by his request to be received into the community. Only gradually were people forced to learn what this new life comprised, to learn somehow that the relation of the sexes was not a matter of moral indifference; that even the nourishment of the body required rules, and that man was not the free lord over his own words.

On the other hand, there now arose the danger of a miscomprehension of the new and great ideas which Christianity had brought forth. They were, according to the word of their Founder, to work gradually, like leaven, in the world, inwardly first, then outwardly; they were little by little to change the universal ideas, so as to make the outward form of life more and more different. The danger rested in the fact that Christians would come to regard existing institutions and conditions as abolished by Christianity, since they were influenced by the spirit of paganism, instead of adapting themselves to them until they were changed by the new spirit. It might be thought that the high position and the freedom which were fitting to the Christian as a

"child of God and heir of eternal life" did not allow any subordination to other men, especially to non-Christians—any subordination of the wife to the husband, of the slave to his master, of subjects to heathen magistrates. The apostle Paul is obliged to prove that the Christian, through his new relation towards God, is in no way exempted from the laws of the community; that he should show his faith in God, who has willed or permitted these regulations, by willing self-submission to them. He is compelled to warn them not to make "freedom a cloak for wickedness." Not without reason the apostle Paul looked at the future of the Christian communities with gloomy forebodings when he thought himself at the end of his ministry. John, too, cries warningly: "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God."

One thing the Church took with her to meet the approaching storms: the writings of her founders, a substitute for their oral preaching and a means through which they could be moved by the spirit of the founder. Attempts were made to keep alive the form, the life, the teaching of Jesus. Collections of His sayings (logia) must soon have been made, with the addition, more or less, of the historical events connected with them.

The Gospel, the good tidings, is the name given to these attempts to recall the facts on which the Christian belief rests. Of those Gospels which are extant, the three with which the New Testament opens are the oldest. There are no cogent reasons for refusing to ascribe the first to the apostle Matthew or to doubt the old account that he wrote his book, in the first place, for the Jewish Christians in Palestine, and, therefore, in the Aramaic language. The Greek version, which we know, may also be attributed to him, since such a bilingual publication of a work is familiar to us from other writers of the time. The correctness of the tradition that the second Gospel is the work of the already mentioned John Mark, the companion of Peter, is vouched for by some peculiarities of the book. The authorship of the third is attributed to Luke the Physician, who, on many occasions accompanied Paul. He wished to produce a treatise on the sacred story for the Gentile Theophilus.



"NERO'S TORCHES"; THE EMPEROR WITNESSING CHRISTIANS COVERED WITH INFLAMMABLE MATERIAL BEING SET ABLAZE
From the painting by Henri de Saenraef, by permission of the Berlin Photographic Co., London, W.



THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY

FOLLOWERS OF THE APOSTLES AND THEIR WORK

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE EARLY CHURCH

AS the coral reefs rise higher and higher from the bottom of the sea, until a storm discloses to those who sail over them the secret growth of long ages, thus Christianity expands in the calm, and the great world knows nothing of it, until suddenly through the storm of persecution a Christian community becomes visible to all. There are records of martyrs from which we learn that in the country of Garamæa, east of the Tigris, south of the Little Zab, Christians dwelt even before 170 A.D. The kingdom of Osroene, having Edessa as its capital, extended along the eastern bank of the Euphrates. There were Christians here at so early a period that the legend could arise of the Agbar, or prince, of this land sending letters to Jesus.

Towards the end of the second century Agbar Bar Manu stamped the sign of the cross on his coins. The governor of Bithynia announced to the emperor, Trajan (98-117), that not only the towns, but also the villages and the plains were full of Christians, the heathen temples were almost deserted, the duty of sacrificing to the gods almost forgotten.

From Egyptian Alexandria, Christianity pushed on towards the south. Not only Jewish and Greek circles were opened to it, but in the next few years a Coptic translation of the writings of the New Testament was able to find circulation, and Christian communities appear in the Thebais. In the same way the Gospel spread towards the east in Arabia and towards the west in the district of Cyrene. From Rome the Christian faith was borne over the sea to Africa, and Carthage became a new colony. At the beginning of the following period (about 200) Tertullian could declare that if a persecution of the Christians were to be carried out, "Carthage must be

decimated." A synod which was held there united no fewer than seventy African and Numidian bishops. The commercial relations between Asia Minor and Southern Gaul facilitated the sowing here of the seed of the new faith. About the year 177 Christian communities flourished there, at Lugdunum (Lyons), and also at Vienne, as we learn from the account of the cruel persecution endured by them, which these communities sent to the churches in Asia and Phrygia.

It is only by chance that we hear anything of new Christian communities. Wherever in the Roman empire or beyond its boundaries Christians came, they spoke of that which was the highest to them. Celsus, the enemy of the Christians, reports in 178: "Weavers, tanners, shoemakers, the most uneducated and roughest men, are the most zealous preachers." At the same time, many Christians made it their life's work to spread their faith. These missionaries were called apostles. The "Teaching of the Apostles," which appeared about 110, required that they should restrict themselves to labouring among the heathen, and permitted them to remain two days, at the longest, in places where Christian communities already existed. In what circles did this new belief find adherents? With the conviction that Christianity was the true wisdom, Paul had complained: "Not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble!"

Common People and Philosophers Accept the Gospel With the view that only those learned in philosophy could judge of such transcendent questions, Celsus scoffed at the uneducated Christians.

But we hear also of philosophers who found in Christianity that which they sought for vainly in the different schools of heathen wisdom. We know of near relations of the emperor who became

Christians. Certainly in the meetings of the Christians there were far more poor men and slaves than noble and learned men. But if we take into consideration how small the number of educated men was at that time in comparison with the mass of uneducated—only one-half per cent. of the inhabitants of Rome belonged to the upper classes—there is absolutely no reason for the assumption that Christianity attracted principally only the uneducated. The Christian literature of this period contradicts such an assumption. Comparatively little of it has been preserved. But in it we find such writings as in no way betray a low standard of education in their authors.

Above all, the wish to possess material for Christian teaching induced persons to alter Jewish writings according to Christian notions. At the end of the first century the "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs" appeared, which places prophecies in the mouths of Jacob's sons, to which are joined moral warnings and references to the fulfilment of the hopes of Christians. Consequently some, through the wish to picture to themselves the beginnings of Christianity in a more clear and thorough manner than the writings preserved from primitive times afforded—others, through the need to lend authority to new but divergent views through ostensibly old records—let themselves be led away into creating new Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Epistles, or Revelations. We are acquainted merely with the names or with scanty fragments of most of such works: and, as a rule, there are no data by which to determine the period of their production and to decide the question whether they should be reckoned as religious romances or as records from ancient times.

The Religious Writers Early in the post-apostolic period must have been composed the "Protevangelium" of James the Younger, which depicts the infancy of Jesus from the birth of his mother, Mary, to the Massacre of the Innocents at Bethlehem. To the same period roughly belong

the Gospel and Revelation of Peter, our knowledge of which has been greatly enriched by the latest discoveries in the monk's grave at Achmin. The former so depicts the story of Jesus' passion that Pilate, the representative of the heathen world, appears in a more favourable light. The latter regards the present Christians as degenerate, and attempts to bring them back to their senses by describing hell and its unspeakable torments. An Asiatic presbyter is said to have composed the "Stories of Paul and Thecla." When called to account for his boldness, he declared he had so treated the subject only out of love for Paul. But this motive could not shield him from deposition. The Church did not wish, like the heretics, that pious frauds should prevail.

A second group of writers of our period is comprised under the title of "Apostolic Fathers." A schism had arisen in the Corinthian community and had led to the



IGNATIUS AWAITING MARTYRDOM IN THE COLOSSEUM Ignatius, the first bishop of Antioch, was taken to Rome in the year 112, and there, in the arena of the Colosseum, he was given over to wild beasts. It is said that his last prayer was, "May I, O God, as Thine own corn, be now so ground between the teeth of these wild beasts that I may become white bread for my Heavenly Master."



POLYCARP'S TESTIMONY FOR CHRIST

Polycarp, the first bishop of Smyrna, long ruled the Christian Church there, but in the reign of Aurelian he suffered martyrdom. Brought before the proconsul, he was asked to deny Christ, but is said to have refused, saying, "Hear my free confession—I am a Christian."

removal of certain presbyters from office. Then—probably in the year 97—the presbyter Clemens sent thither from Rome a letter exhorting them to humility and love. Clemens did not call himself Bishop of Rome, and did not even mention his own name—"The Church of God on pilgrimage at Rome, to the Church of God abiding at Corinth in a strange land." A second letter, known under the name of the "Second Letter of Clemens," certainly did not emanate from that presbyter. It was probably written about 140, and is not a letter but the oldest Christian sermon of which we know, an exhortation to the "trial and conflict in this life, that we may be crowned in the life to come."

The famous Hermas was a layman; his writings bore the title of "Shepherd," because the angel of repentance, in whose mouth most of the exhortations are placed, is introduced by him as a shepherd. In the form of visions the point is impressed

that there is yet time for repentance. This writing at first enjoyed such high esteem in the Church that it was almost placed on a level with the Holy Scriptures of primitive times, and reckoned at any rate worthy of being read aloud in divine service. This fact should be evidence that it appeared at an early date, somewhere at the beginning of the second century. The so-called "Epistle of Barnabas," which may belong to the same time, stood in high esteem in Alexandria, although the author carries his opposition to Judaism to such a pitch as to declare the observance of the Mosaic laws by the Jews to be a diabolic error, and although he puts a new interpretation on the Old Testament by means of almost incredibly bold allegories.

A peculiar interest is presented by the seven letters which the bishop Ignatius of Antioch wrote in 112, on his way to martyrdom at Rome, to different communities in Asia Minor and to the bishop Polycarp in order to exhort them to steadfastness and concord. He begs the Christians at Rome not to make another attempt to liberate him, for he is absolutely convinced that death will lead him to life, and that by anything which he might

still say or do in life he would not be able to testify so forcibly to his faith as through steadfast endurance of death by the teeth of the wild beasts in the arena at Rome.

Soon after his death we find the letter of Polycarp from Smyrna to the community in Philippi, which had asked him to send all the writings of the martyr that were in his hands. This letter contains so many quotations from the New Testament Scriptures that it is at the same time of importance as an eloquent testimony of their antiquity. While the Christian literature of this

The First Evangelical Writings period which we have so far mentioned was intended for Christians, the third series of writings was directed to the heathen. It was called forth by the new position which the pagan world, especially the state authorities, assumed towards Christianity. Up to the beginning of the post-apostolic era the Christians had certainly suffered from the hatred of the

Jews. The Roman state, on the contrary, as a rule, laid no obstacles in their way, holding as yet no regard for them. Sprung from Judaism, they were reckoned as a Jewish sect. When they were suddenly, in the year 64, recognised at Rome as an independent body, and were persecuted by the state, the disregard which was again

Why Nero Massacred the Christians

shown them during the next decades, proves that such exceptional procedure requires a special explanation. The motive of the massacre of the Christians by Nero was merely the need of the emperor to shift upon others the suspicion that he had set fire to the capital of the world for his own pleasure. Who should these others be but the Jews, especially those who had their stalls where the fire broke out? And how could these escape the danger threatening them more simply and safely than by diverting the suspicion from themselves to the hated Christians? Thus the state authorities learnt to make a difference between the Jews and the Christians of the town, but only for the immediate occasion. The authorities never believed in the real guilt of these Christians, and the previous state of indifference towards them continued.

The position must have become quite different when the outbreak and failure of the Jewish rising not only entirely separated the Christians from the Jews in internal relations, but compelled them to take precautions no longer to be mistaken for a Jewish party. And now, when the distinction between them and the Jews was universally known, it was perceived that their number had become unsuspectedly large, and was increasing every day on a scale which had never been noticed in any sect. It had become impossible to disregard them.

The fact that the Christians wished to be regarded as different from all others, that they did not attend the popular festivals,

How the Pagans Misrepresented Christianity

closely connected with the state cult, and the licentious or brutal spectacles in which the people expressed their national self-consciousness, that they defined the task of life so differently from the rest of the world, and staked their all on something other and presumably higher than wealth, honour, or enjoyment—this irritated the heathen world. It invented, spread, and believed only too gladly incredible crimes of this weird sect which

could not be measured by any traditional standard. At their secret meals they were said to slaughter and eat children—perhaps a listener had once heard the words, "Take and drink all of this; this cup is the New Testament in my Blood." Or they were reported to indulge in the grossest immorality—perhaps a spy had once seen the Christians before the celebration of the sacred feast giving each other the kiss of brotherhood, but had not reported that only men with men and women with women thus showed their close bonds of union. Men felt themselves the more entitled to attribute these crimes to them since they were indignant at their secret proceedings. It is quite comprehensible that under such circumstances the persecutions of the Christians were on many occasions due to the wishes of the mass of the people.

The courts, however, needed the support of the law before they could accede to such demands. Three laws of the empire could be brought to bear on the question. The law of the Twelve Tables forbade men to have other gods than those publicly

Christianity as Treason to the State

recognised. The Julian law as to treason declared everything to be a crime against the state which bore in itself the character of secret discontent with the government—for example, secret nightly meetings. The law as to sacrilege, finally, was directed against the refusal to sacrifice to the gods or to the genius of the emperor. It is clear that all these laws rest on the same conception. Everything, even religion, must be subordinate to the state. Not that which is true must be believed; not that which is moral must be done; the welfare of the state stands above truth and morality. It is a crime against the state to doubt the religion adopted by the state and not to submit to it. Would the Christians admit this theory? In so doing they would give up their Christianity. For, according to Christianity, religion is the personal bond between man and God which has to precede all other relations.

Therefore, there was nothing left to the state but to compel these Christians by its own power to adopt its religion. But if they could not be forced to do so, if their fellowship with God was worth more to them than life itself, then the question was bound to arise whether the state could maintain its position against such unexampled constancy and slay until not one of

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY

these heroes was left on earth, or whether, finally, vanquished by the supernatural, it would abandon its claim and bow before the God of these Christians. A tremendous spectacle, this struggle for life and death between the Roman state, equipped with the united strength of this world, and this band of Christians, with no other power at their disposal than the power to die.

As early as the reign of Domitian the blood of Christians flowed in Rome. Where after that they were brought to trial no one can say. As the younger Pliny, governor of Bithynia, in the year 112 inquired from the emperor Trajan how he was to deal with the Christians, persecutions must already have taken place. Pliny excused his inquiry on the plea that he had never yet been present at the trials of Christians. He begged for information on the question whether those Christians also who had committed no offences were to be condemned; whether, that is to say, the mere fact of being a Christian was punishable, and whether he was authorised to discharge those who, by invocation of the gods and by sacrifices before the statue of the

**The
Proscribed
Name**

emperor, proved their loyalty to the state even if previously they had been Christians. The emperor answered both questions in the affirmative, but forbade officials to spy out the Christians or to give credit to anonymous suspicions. Christianity was evidently to him only an extravagance, innocent in itself, but also unlawful, and one which could not be declared permissible. This correspondence was published a few years after. Accordingly, a definite precedent for the treatment of the Christians was established for the officials, which was observed up to the middle of the third century. What a peculiar position was created by that edict! "When dealing with the Christians," complains Tertullian, "they punish not deeds, but the name." And yet they did not punish the use of the name Christian as an illegal act, which is punished, even if it is not likely to be repeated. On the contrary, a man could win complete exemption from penalty if he relinquished the name temporarily—a man might be a Christian before and after the judicial proceeding.

What real strength must Christianity have had in itself if, despite this easy means of defence, Christians never thought to make use of it, and regarded those members of their community who did make use of it

as no longer Christians! What love for truthfulness must this Christian faith have inculcated! It was the name which was punished, and yet not only a name, but a deed.

No one can say how far this persecution, which we hear of through Pliny, extended. The head of the community at Jerusalem, Simeon, fell. One of the last victims was Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, who was dragged to Rome to be thrown before the wild beasts. But up to the end of the post-apostolic time the hatred against the Christians kept breaking out, now here, now there, into violent eruptions. The notion that Christians were punishable as such was so universal that the heathen people regarded a formal judicial inquiry as unnecessary punctiliousness, and wished the Christians to be punished without it. In public disasters men thought they could trace the wrath of the gods. "If the Tiber rises to the houses, if the Nile does not rise over the fields, if the earth shakes, if famine or pestilence breaks out, straightway the people cry out, 'To the lions with the Christians!'" Antoninus Pius (138-161) was compelled to issue edicts which enforced strict observance of legal methods with regard to such violent proceedings. Yet the state never doubted its ability to annihilate completely this preposterous movement so soon as it seemed necessary. To be obliged to fear it was pure absurdity!

This new situation, that both the bulk of the population and the authorities considered Christianity worthy of notice and of opposition, produced a new class of literature, the apologetic. Experience taught that neither the self-vindication of the Christians when placed before the courts, nor the fact of their moral purity were sufficient to move their opponents from their hatred. The attempt had, therefore, to be made to obtain another verdict, through writings intended to prove all hostile reproaches to be meaningless and Christianity to be the fulfilment of that for which the nobler heathen also craved. Soon there were Christian philosophers and rhetoricians, heads of committees, who addressed such writings sometimes to the heathen generally, sometimes directly to the emperor.

Born in Samaria of Hellenic parents, Justin had sought for certainty of religious

conviction in one school of philosophy after another, and had found it at last in Christianity. This, therefore, was reckoned by him as the true philosophy, in the sense that it actually performed that which philosophy only promised to give. He did not for this reason doff his philosopher's cloak, but tried by lectures and

**Justin
the
Martyr**

disputations to win adherents to Christianity. About the year 150 he addressed an apology to Antoninus Pius, and soon afterwards, moved by a specially outrageous case of an unjust sentence against Christians, he published a second and shorter apology. As he had risen through philosophy to Christianity, so he now gladly pointed to the fact that among the nobler philosophers traces of the same divine wisdom appear which manifested itself perfectly in Jesus. But there speaks in his writings not only a lover of wisdom, who has to do with mere knowledge, but a manly character glad to die for the truth.

"You can kill, but you cannot harm us!" He, indeed, suffered scourging and death at Rome in the year 165, together with a number of his scholars, "because they would not sacrifice to the gods."

The same road to Christianity led his pupil Tatian, who was of Assyrian stock, to another conception of what previously had been dear to him. He, too, found at last among the Christians that which he in vain looked for among the Greeks. But he was concerned, above all, with the question of moral regeneration. He therefore saw now only the dark side in Greek philosophy and art, and in his "Speech to the Greeks" praised Christianity as the truth, accessible even to the uneducated, which morally recreated mankind.

Quite contrary is the method of the "Representations on Behalf of the Christians"—the ordinary translation, "Petition (Supplicatio) for the Christians,"

**Philosophers
Defend
Christianity**

is hardly a correct rendering of the meaning of *προσέβητα πρὸς τοὺς ἡγεμένους*, the somewhat difficult Greek title—which the otherwise unknown "Athenian philosopher," Athenagoras, addressed to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. He not only answered the taunts and charges of crime flung at the Christians, but tried also to prove that precisely those views which were condemned in Christians were to be found in a similar form in heathen

philosophers. In a second writing on the Resurrection he sought to represent this single doctrine as in no way unreasonable.

The classical treatise of the Roman advocate, Minucius Felix, may have been written about 180. In form it followed Cicero's "De Natura Deorum" as a model. It is entitled "Octavius," because its contents are in the form of a conversation which Octavius, the friend of the author, holds on the seashore near Ostia with the heathen Cæcilius about the Christian and heathen religions. The latter, a sceptic, is disgusted at the positiveness with which uneducated Christians judge of God and God's attributes. Simply because nothing is certain, he maintains men ought to adhere to the traditional belief in the gods. All that the average pagan education of that time could adduce against Christianity could be freely expressed in this discussion. Octavius makes a friendly answer, but with such clearness and emphasis that his opponent finally declares himself vanquished. "We then went joyous and glad on our way. Cæcilius rejoiced that he had become a believer,

**Teachers
of the
Love of God**

Octavius that he had conquered, and I that my Cæcilius had become a believer and that my Octavius had conquered."

While the above-mentioned and similar writings were only intended for such heathens as despised Christianity or hated and persecuted it, and, therefore, were meant only to demonstrate to them the baselessness of their hostility, and selected isolated points against which to direct their attack, passing over in silence the deepest truths of Christianity, another treatise of this class was able to work more freely, since it was meant for a man who already faced Christianity with some interest and goodwill.

The unknown author of the "Letter to Diognetus," a man who was capable, through classical acquirements, of writing in a pure style, had no need to shrink from describing to such a man the great truth of Christianity, which might seem to the genuine pagan a degradation of the Divinity, the truth that "God is love." To this love, he explained, a man must surrender himself. In joyful gratitude he cannot but love God in return, and from this springs also brotherly love. Thus Christianity is the religion of the spirit and of truth, which can surmount all incidental, individual, and national distinctions, and is

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY

able to create new men. "Its adherents are not differentiated from other men by country, speech, or any external qualities; they take part in everything as citizens, and are satisfied with everything as strangers. They live in the world, and yet are not of the world. They obey the existing laws, but by their life transcend the requirements of the law. They love all and are persecuted by all. They are not known, and yet they are condemned. They are put to death, and by this led to life."

Even in these few words a breath of that peculiar spirit is wafted towards us which inspired these early Christians, and is apparent in all the extant literature of that time. Everything is sustained by the consciousness that the Christian has found something inexpressibly great; that his life has gained a glorious importance, an exalted purpose; that the discord in it is abolished; that unity and harmony has entered into its thoughts, will, and deed. Ignatius calls the Christians "Bearers of God, bearers of Christ, bearers of the Holy One, adorned on all sides by the commands of Jesus Christ." He terms Christianity "something colossal." The Christians are not perplexed because the heathen do not understand it. That which faith gives remains concealed to profane eyes. But they know themselves to be so rich that the keynote of their life is joy. Even Hermas, the earnest

preacher of repentance, can write: "Banish all sorrow. It is worse than all evil spirits. The spirit of God which is granted you endures no sorrow and no complaining. Put on the joyous mood, which is ever well pleasing to God. Let it be well to thee in Him. For all live in God who cast away sorrow and clothe themselves in pure joyousness." Conscious that in truth they need not be ashamed of their faith and of their life, and that no power of the world could take from them their unseen kingdom, the Christians scorned to beg for mercy. Even in the apologies which were laid down at the throne of the rulers of the world no cringing or flattery is found. "Not with flattery nor begging

for forgiveness do we come before you," writes Justin. Rightly has it been said that there was here no trace to be found of a submissive, sorrowful, apologetic tone. The consciousness of fighting for the

Cleavage Among the Christians

truth, and of being able to die for it, gave them a dignified bearing, and they did not shrink from any attempt to make the murderous opponent feel his own grievous injustice. The Cæsars thus came to hear a strain hitherto unknown to them. In their meetings for divine worship the Christians prayed fervently for their emperor, whom their God had appointed. How could they, speaking before this emperor, in order merely to obtain indulgence, deny that Christianity was something hitherto unknown? While the Christians were thus fighting against the

annihilation which threatened them from the heathen world, that current in their midst, of which we have already noticed the first traces in the apostolic age, grew stronger. The storms from without coincide with a process of disintegration within.

The more the old religions lost in estimation, the greater was the tendency to put new philosophic interpretations on the old myths, to find in them popular descriptions of profound ideas, and then to blend the ideas won from various religions into one speculative system. Thus a distinction was made between

the religion to be conceded to the uneducated and the Gnosis, a knowledge which was to be accessible only to a select band. This was to solve the riddle of the universe; above all, to give a clear evidence as to the origin, meaning, and object of the dualism which pervades everything, of the contrast between idea and sensible manifestation, between good and evil, between light and darkness. This movement of the times affected the Christian communities also. Primitive Christianity wished to give fellowship with God; but he who found that fellowship extolled also "the wealth in wisdom and knowledge" which had become his.

And, without doubt, Christianity announced many thoughts quite new to the heathen world; so those men turned to it



A FATHER OF THE CHURCH
Born of Greek parentage, Justin, the martyr, was a Platonic philosopher, but became a Christian and wrote in defence of the faith.

who looked to it for an actual solution of speculative problems and for a means of satisfying their eagerness for knowledge. Soon the numbers of the Christians had become too great to be completely free from such elements. They drew other Christians to themselves, promising to them knowledge higher than the common

Mingling of Paganism and Christianity

belief which the Church could give. A society of the initiated was formed. The magic system of mysteries with its symbolic actions and secret consecrations was borrowed from the heathen world, in order that not merely the understanding but also the spirit might be contented. Essentially all this was paganism. But it accepted Christian thoughts, above all, the idea of redemption, and in this process of evolution assigned a place to Him from whom Christians take their name. Yet they do not mean by this that redemption from sin and its consequences which Christianity desires, but a redemption from the world, a liberation of the spiritual from the material, of the light from the darkness.

Endless is the variety of these different Gnostic systems, strange, weird, bizarre phantoms in the pale moonlight; a mixture of the most opposite cults, of Greek and Jewish philosophy, Syro-Phœnician theories as to the creation of the world, the astrology and magic of the East; all hardly to be grasped by modern conceptions. Some required strict asceticism and won over many by their conspicuous sanctity. Others declared that they were raised above the lower laws of conventional morality, and did not wish to resist the all-powerful impulses of Nature. They all offered the hand of friendship to Christianity if it would only adapt itself to the new and brightly glittering fabric.

A serious menace to the Church! Fixed standards were still wanting by which to test what doctrines were authorised in the Church. There were, indeed,

The Gnostics Against the Church

holy writings from the primitive times of Christianity; but the Gnostics also appealed to these in support of their views, putting arbitrary interpretations on them by means of the system of figurative explanation prevalent among the Christians. At the same time they themselves fabricated professedly apostolic writings, and prided themselves on being in possession of a secret tradition which only the chosen apostles could have

received. Who was to decide what was truth? The order of independent prophets was still esteemed. The offices in the Church were still appointed without regard to unity. The connection between the communities was as loose as ever. Only one thing was left which could teach them to recognise and avoid the troubled waters that were surging in—that was the Christian spirit. Would it be clear and strong enough to repel this self-conscious, insinuating Gnosis? The Church recognised this enemy, presenting itself as a friend. It did not rest until he was overcome. But the ensuing period will show that the Church itself in the course of these hard struggles assumed another form.

We notice the first tendencies in this direction early in the post-apostolic period. A college of elders or bishops had formerly stood at the head of the communities. We now find in the letters of Ignatius mention of a single bishop, though his epistle to the Romans does not mention the supremacy of the bishop of that community. The letter of Polycarp shows the same thing regarding the community

The Need of a Central Organisation

at Philippi. But the communities in Asia Minor were already under *one* bishop, with presbyters and deacons below him. Was it, perhaps, the apostle John who in these communities, where he had gone to minister after Paul's death, introduced the arrangement, which he had learnt to value at Jerusalem, in order to have a responsible representative in those places where he could not be present personally? This is suggested by the circumstance that each of the seven "circular letters" in his Apocalypse is addressed to one "angel" of the community in Asia Minor. In any case, the new feature soon gained increasing ground for itself. The greater the dangers which threatened the communities from without and from within, the more was the wish felt for a central administration.

The need of episcopacy and of a definite centre for Christianity, made the choice of Rome, where both St. Peter and St. Paul had been martyred, inevitable. From the fear that divisions might arise in the communities, Ignatius on his way to death warned them urgently to hold fast to their connection with the bishop. Yet he did not thereby set forth a theory that men should subject themselves blindly to bishops as such. On the contrary,

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY

since he knew that these bishops, to whose communities he addressed himself, were true "overseers," bishops after God's heart, he writes: "Whoever does not follow the will of his bishops opposes the will of God." But later the views as to the importance of the office were changed, for it was only too easy to understand such utterances to mean that all bishops were representatives of God by virtue of their office. The later extension of meaning taught this.

A second point arose in post-apostolic times. What was more natural than that the man who desired baptism should pronounce in some way or other his assent to the Christian faith? At first this must have been done in the shortest form, some addition to the formula adopted by the baptiser: "I baptise thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," which is also prescribed in the "Teaching of the Apostles." If, then, heresies had to be rejected, short explanatory sentences were certainly added to that brief expression. Thus a rule of faith was formed which served to distinguish, as it were, the universal faith from perversions of it. The significance of this countersign was bound to increase as the number of those who desired to be received into the Church grew greater, and as, therefore, it became more desirable to possess a short epitome of that which constituted the Christian faith.


Such epitomes were at first, as might be expected, different in the different countries. But the increase of intercourse between the various communities made it necessary to adjust such differences by accepting sentences that appeared important and were customary elsewhere, and by excluding what was too comprehensive. In the conviction that they were expressing nothing else in such sentences than what the founders of the Church, the apostles, had taught, this rule of faith was called "the apostolic confession of faith." In any case, before the middle of the second century some such "creed" was in use, almost exactly like that in use at the present time. Whether this earliest creed was composed in Rome, or based on a confession originating in the East is uncertain.

We notice the beginnings of a third action of the Church. The sacred Scriptures of the Jews were accepted by the Christians as inspired by the spirit of God. Extracts from them were read aloud in

the services. Together with these came letters of the apostle Paul and other works of Christian authors. In order to multiply the available materials for the edification of the public, the communities exchanged such writings among themselves. When the original apostles were dead and the "prophets" became fewer, these writings replaced what was lost. At the same time also the need arose of not permitting all and every Christian writing to be read aloud at divine service, but of examining whether by age and contents it was suitable for the purpose. This question became still more weighty when the Gnostics attempted to secure the recognition of their heresies by means of edited or forged writings; and when Marcion, a Christian enthusiastic for Paul, about 150, wished to find distortions of the true Christianity in a series of writings which up till then had been reckoned apostolic, and rejected some and mutilated others.

The important point now was that everything which, as dating from the foundation of the Church, must count as apostolic, whether composed by an apostle himself or by another witness of the earliest times, should be definitely separated from other literature; and it was material whether the contents of such literature were orthodox or tainted with heresy. The problem was to construct a "canon." The first list of this kind which is extant—unfortunately, in mutilated form, and, therefore, not to be certainly defined as to its extent—called after its discoverer, Ludovico Antonio Muratori, the "Muratorian canon"—contained twenty-two out of the twenty-seven writings collected in the present New Testament, and is said to have been made in Rome about 180. Some 130 years later we learn, through the Church historian, Eusebius, that not even then were all the writings in our present New Testament popularly recognised; the decision was still wavering over the Epistle of St. James, the two Epistles of Peter, the second and third Epistles of St. John, and the Epistle of Jude. In 360 Athanasius put forth a tract, in which these writings also were reckoned canonical.

The Church thus sought to win a firmer position and fixed standards, that it might not lose its course and be wrecked in the overpowering fury of the waves. It has, in fact, become the Catholic Church.



THE EARLY CHURCH TRIUMPHANT: CONSTANTINE THE GREAT PRESENTING ST. SILVESTER WITH A STATUETTE OF ROME
From the painting by Peroni to the Vatican. Photo by Anderson, Rome.



THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN BEING

ITS EARLY TRIALS AND TRIUMPHS

STRUGGLE BETWEEN HEATHENISM & CHRISTIANITY

ALTHOUGH during the previous period the Christians had been an oppressed and cruelly persecuted body, they were not exterminated. "The blood of the martyrs had been the seed of the Church." The rage of the storm was spent. It would seem that men had grown weary of murder as an ineffective measure. It is true that the existing law made the trial of Christians possible, and that bloody persecutions still occurred, but a period of comparative rest had begun.

Men, moreover, ascended the imperial throne who lacked the moral power to hate a religion. The Roman bishop, Victor, was able to acquire influence over the profligate Commodus (180-192). Septimius Severus (211) took a Christian slave, to whom he owed his cure, into his palace and protected the Christians who held high posts round him; and he is said to have given a Christian nurse to his son, Caracalla. The Christian author, Hippolytus, carried on a correspondence with the second wife of Elagabalus. Alexander Severus placed the pictures of Abraham and Jesus among his household gods in the Lararium. "The maxims of the Master came readily to his lips." Over a room in his palace he had the saying of Christ written up: "Do unto others what you would that they should do unto you!" The empress-mother was on intimate terms with the famous teacher of the Church, Origen.

Christian Influence on the Emperors Philip the Arabian (244-249) is said actually to have been a Christian; and even if it were only a legend, yet what a change it implies that such a story could have been told and believed!

The sword of Damocles hanging over the Christian name, which had formerly kept so many back from Christianity, and which had served closely to sift the communities, now seemed to have been

taken away. The heathen pressed in masses into the Church. Once it had been the aim of the Christians to rescue individuals from the "world which lay in wickedness" for the approaching day of judgment, and not to bow before the power of the enemy, but to regard the martyr's crown as the noblest ornament.

Increased Importance of the Bishops Now they ventured to think, as Origen writes, that all other religions would perish and that the divine truth would in the end rule alone on earth.

In what a new aspect appear the chiefs, especially of the Christian communities! How greatly has the importance of these pastors increased through the growth of the flock, through the increase of the burden of work laid on them, especially as these large communities, constantly feeling less inclination to act themselves, entrusted all church work to the bishops! The presbyters and deacons proved soon insufficient to manage everything. Thus, in the second quarter of the third century new officials were created for the performance of the inferior services, such as subdeacons, readers, exorcists, and acolytes.

But in order that the single guidance might be secured, the offices formed a graduated system, at the head of which stood the one bishop. Formerly this office had been regarded as a hard test of loving service towards the community, and the only privilege of the leader had been to die first in the fight. Now, it might be reckoned an honour, flattering to pride, to stand at the head of these great communities, recruiting themselves from the highest ranks in the empire. The rights of the office now became a prerogative. Rivalry between the priests and the laymen became possible. Tertullian, who wished to check this development, could exclaim wrathfully

and prove by the manner of his protest that the new movement had touched him already, "Are not laymen priests? Where three are, there is the Church, even though they be laymen."

But how could the tendency be checked?

If these masses were to be held together by the Church, submission to the bishops must be exacted. And in order to justify this unwonted claim the bishops were clothed with the same honour which men had been accustomed to show to the apostles, the founders of the Church. A second cause hastened this development. Men appealed to the Holy Scriptures in order to refute the heretics. But how was it to prove to them that such standards really dated from the first origin of Christianity? No one was alive whose memory reached back to that age. Was there, then, no substitute for such witnesses? Tertullian writes: "Make inquiry among the apostolic churches, among those especially where the chairs from which the apostles taught still stand in their place, where the originals of their letters are still read aloud." But what persons in these communities could give the most certain information? Evidently the bishops. The apostles had placed such men as pastors in the communities founded by them, and the latter had again appointed as their successors the men who had absorbed most accurately the original doctrine.

The Apostolic Succession stand in their place, where the originals of their letters are still read aloud." But what persons in these communities could give the most certain information? Evidently the bishops. The apostles had placed such men as pastors in the communities founded by them, and the latter had again appointed as their successors the men who had absorbed most accurately the original doctrine.

The unbroken succession of these officials guaranteed in the earliest times certain information on points about which men could, unfortunately, no longer inquire from the apostles themselves. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, was a pupil of Polycarp, who had sat at the feet of the apostle John. As, in consequence of this, he himself was able to say what the original faith was, he declared it as a general rule, about 180, that the heads of the apostolic communities were qualified, by virtue of their succession in office, to state the truth. He was not speaking of any power of infallibility handed down to them from the apostles; he meant only that such communities, and especially their heads,

were in possession of historical truth valuable in the struggle against the heretics. As an instance, "since it would take too long to relate the succession in office of all churches," he mentions the "greatest, oldest, and best-known" community, that of the Church of Rome. An inquiry made of them alone would certainly be sufficient, since naturally all other communities in which the apostolic tradition was preserved would agree with its answer. Such significant phrases could not be misunderstood or misinterpreted when the inroad of the masses and the rush of different ideas into the Church rendered desirable some governing body with authority to decide disputed questions! Quite plainly could these words be read to mean that the bishop's office was the bearer of the truth!

Another sentence of Irenæus could then be distorted: "Where the Church is, there is the spirit of God. To be outside the Church is to be outside the truth." Thus he writes after he has demonstrated that the "preaching of the Church is uniformly the truth as testified by the apostles, and the teaching of that which is outside the Church is 'perverted' truth." He adds, however: "And where the spirit of God is, there is the Church; but the spirit is the truth."

He declares only the clearly proven fact that truth is to be found in the Church, and not among the heretics. But that sentence, torn away from the context, carried a great thesis in itself, since by the "Church" was understood the external corporation of the Church to which the bishops guaranteed the apostolic truth. It was but a short step to the next proposition, that the Church was formed by the bishops, and truth and salvation were to be found only in connection with them. At this time, too, the desire for a visible unity of all communities became continually stronger. How, then, was order to be maintained in these great communities which were in perpetual flux if identical doctrines and identical procedure did not link them together? The name "Catholic Church" is found, indeed, in Ignatius; but he



ORIGEN OF ALEXANDRIA
Among the early fathers of the Church he was the most notable for his immense literary services. A Greek of Alexandria, he was brought up in the Christian faith.

Unity in the Church

communities became continually stronger. How, then, was order to be maintained in these great communities which were in perpetual flux if identical doctrines and identical procedure did not link them together? The name "Catholic Church" is found, indeed, in Ignatius; but he

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN BEING

meant by it the ideal aggregate community, scattered throughout the whole world (καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης), in contradistinction to the individual community. But now it was desired to mould the aggregate into a comprehensible, definite unity, in order that each individual might know to what to hold fast, and not be led astray. What else could represent this unity except the office of bishop?

Hippolytus, the pupil of Irenæus, already declares the bishops to be the *diadochi*, or successors, of the apostles, participating in the same grace of the high priesthood and of teaching as they did. In the middle of the third century Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (248-258), elaborates

also to decide to whom the divine gifts belong. They are not merely administrators, but judges in the Church. They are thus in the fullest sense what the priests were among the Jews.

Now, the duties incumbent on the bishops were considered priestly, and the bishops were regarded as priests.

Duties of the Bishops Only they might administer the mysteries (sacraments) of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Their offering at the Lord's Supper was a sacrifice. Formerly the gift of the bread and wine for this holy meal, brought by the community, was called the sacrifice of the community. In the same way the prayers of the Christians, in particular the prayer at the Holy Eucharist, were designated a sacrifice. But the priest offers the body and blood of Christ as a sacrifice to God.

"The priest imitates what Christ has done when He offered Himself to the Father." The bishops are regarded as holding their high office from God Himself, although the community may have co-operated in their election. It is, therefore, presumption to assume that a bishop is not worthy of his office. He acts, therefore, from the "inspiration of the Holy Ghost."

Thus believers are bound to the bishops. The unity of the Church is represented in them. The old conception is forgotten, according to which the "number of believers" is the Church, and "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," makes a man member of this Church. Not everyone who, by virtue of the faith and the baptism, has the one Lord belongs to the Church; but "whosoever has not the Church as mother cannot have God as father." "Outside the Church is no salvation." And this Church is the outward community, represented by the bishops. Only he who submits to the episcopacy stands in the Church.

To sustain this claim it was necessary that all bishops should desire and command one and the same thing. As early as 180-200 the representatives of the communities here and there felt the need of counsel as to their official action in difficult questions. They held synods. It was naturally the political



THE MARTYRDOM OF ORIGEN

It was under the decree of Decius in the year 254 A.D., that Origen met the fate he had coveted even as a youth. His warders are here seen taunting him with the fiery torment he goes forth to face.

the thoughts of his time as to the existence of a Church into a self-contained system. That is true of the bishops which Christ said to the apostles filled with the spirit of God, "Whoever hears you, hears Me." Only through the bishops are the divine mercies communicated to us. They have

capital of a province where assemblies were held, and it was the bishop of this town who made preparations for it and assumed the presidency. It thus followed,

How the Metropolitans Originated

as a matter of course, that the metropolitan gradually came to be regarded as the unifying force of the episcopacy of the province. Of the capitals, some had peculiar importance in the eyes of the Christians. Rome was not only the capital of the world, but it held the bones of Peter and Paul, the apostolic princes. Alexandria, the second city of the empire, was renowned as the seat of Christian learning. Antioch, the third city of the empire, had long had the apostle Paul for its teacher. Ephesus numbered a specially large Christian community, and Paul, as well as John, had long been at its head. The countries round Carthage received the Gospel from it. Assuredly in any disputed questions it was more valuable to have the bishop of such a community on one's side than the bishop of some unknown place.

There was, indeed, at first no claim of prerogatives, but the urban bishops already enjoyed a higher estimation. It was the beginning of the patriarchate system of the visible unity of several provinces. Soon there would be the sole problem, that of fixing a central point for the aggregate of all Churches. One bishop already asserted a claim to such a position—the bishop of Rome.

Who knows whether Cyprian, if he had been bishop of Rome, would not have crowned the fabric of his Church with the claim that the Roman bishop was the high priest placed over all priests? But he was bishop of Carthage, and had not always agreed with the decisions of the bishop of Rome, and, therefore, most vehemently opposed the claim of Rome

to the primacy over all other Churches. Yet Cyprian's longing not merely to imagine the episcopacy as a unity, but actually to see it, was so great that he at least put forward the proposition that Christ intended the episcopacy to be *one* in investing Peter with all the powers enjoyed by the other apostles. Thus the successor of Peter, the bishop of Rome, represents the unity of the bishops and with it that of the Church. This Roman

community, the community of Peter, was indeed that "from which the unity of the bishops took its origin," which more than all others strove for unity among the bishops. What men dreaded, then, was, nevertheless, greatly desired. Doubtless, the desire would prevail

over the dread. It would cost hard struggles, because now office in the Church was regarded as a privilege and was valued as the highest calling and carried highest honour. But the whole course of events set irresistibly towards the establishment of a primacy.

As a firmly compacted unity the Church might better hope to keep together, to lead, and to educate the masses that were pressing into it, even such as were as yet little moved by the Christian spirit. It is not strange that now the whole rule of faith, which was originally a mere declaration of the existing creed, was fixed more and more as a *law* of faith, to which all must submit who wished to belong to the Church. But personal belief could

not be coerced, and no one wished to bar unnecessarily admission into the Church. What was left, then, except to be content with the absence of spoken opposition to the Church? And what was more natural than to regard



A BISHOP OF THE EARLY CHURCH

This carefully detailed portrait of a bishop of the early Church is reproduced from a very ancient mosaic in the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN BEING

the submission to the law of faith established by the Church as the badge of Christianity? Many pagans, especially the educated men among them, could not yet reconcile themselves to this rule of faith.

But men were already hopeful that the whole world would become Christian; and an attempt was, therefore, made to bring the belief of the Church as near as possible to the educated among its disparagers and to force it on their convictions. It was necessary to reduce Christian doctrine to a complete system which could be compared with the systems of the heathen philosophers. Where could this need have been more keenly felt than in Alexandria, that most prominent abode of Hellenic learning? No one, unless familiar with this, and able to reconcile philosophy, could hope to influence wider circles. There was a second incentive. Gnosticism dazzled many men, for it promised a deep knowledge, not accessible to all. If it was to be defeated, it must be shown that pure Christianity granted wisdom and knowledge.

What a task was set by this! It was desired to give a scientific form to the Christian doctrine, and yet the only available method of scientific thought was that of Hellenic philosophy. It was necessary to try how far this was adapted to the statement of Christianity, and everything had to be excluded which originated in the heathen conceptions of the world. This required not merely extraordinary acuteness of thought, but also an absolutely pure knowledge of Christianity. Those who first set about the gigantic work could pride themselves on the former qualification, but not on the latter, for everywhere in the Church

Teaching of the Apostles Forgotten
there was now present a dimness of conception regarding the nature of Christianity. Precisely those doctrines which the apostle Paul had expressed in so clear a manner, forming as they did the kernel of what was essentially Christianity, were all forgotten.

It might seem the conception of "faith" was so changed that it no longer could take

the predominant place which Jesus and Paul had assigned to it. In its room a code of morals had entered which might be termed a mixture of Jewish and heathen ethics. Thus one fundamental difference between paganism and Christianity



CYPRIAN OF CARTHAGE
Though born in heathenism the early Church had no more austere and devoted member than Cyprian, who suffered martyrdom in 258 A.D.

was no longer recognised, and conceptions and ideas common in the heathen philosophy were unhesitatingly employed to expound Christianity. The result would have been a complete change in Christianity if at the same time the conviction had not been firm that the Holy Scriptures of the early period were based on divine revelation, and, therefore, must be maintained as the foundation. Their decisive utterances would, no doubt, have been completely misinterpreted by means of the favourite allegorical explanation had not the short

sentences of the rule of faith, universally handed down as unassailable, raised too loud a protest. The creed of the Church saved the Church from complete degeneration. Pantænus, Clemens, Origen, worked in this line in the school at Alexandria.

Bridge from Paganism to Christianity
They made the conception of the "Logos," which is borrowed, according to its contents, from Greek philosophy, the central point of their theology. This is the absolute reason, the principle which binds God to the world. It was also operative in the heathen world. The Platonic philosophy derived truth from the "Logos." In Christianity, again, the "Logos" has become man, and, therefore, the full and pure truth is present in it. Thus a saving bridge was constructed from paganism to Christianity. It did not need a leap to go from the wisdom of the world to the faith of the Christian, only one step, a step forward.

The Catholic Church is organised. Christianity has defined its faith, and has gained unity of organisation. The church system has interposed itself as mediator of salvation between God and man, but, on the other hand, has attained the possibility of communicating to the great mass some of the benefits of salvation. The danger is lest communion with the Church take the place of communion with God;

but as admission into the communion of the Church is made easier, the way is afforded to those who are dissatisfied with the world of pressing on to communion with God. But before this new position is completely attained a raging tempest bursts rendering everything doubtful. The last seventy years had taught incon-

A Struggle of Life and Death testably that to let Christianity alone was merely to further its supremacy. It had been seen as well that partial persecutions were useless, and, indeed, merely afforded the Christians the opportunity to prove the constancy of their faith and to make new conquests. It had been made clear that the struggle between paganism and Christianity was one of life and death. And perhaps it was already too late for the former to conquer. But was the world still capable of enthusiasm for the heathen faith? Had not the old belief in the gods long since been shaken and now shattered by the ridicule of the Christian writers? Yet religion was more necessary now than ever. Warmed by the brightly glowing fire of Christian faith, the yearning for the Invisible had flared up again in the hearts of many who had felt themselves contented by none of the religions known to them, and had turned their backs on metaphysics.

Numbers, however, thus awakened from religious indifference, did not wish to turn to Christianity, for they hated it. Yet they could no longer despise it. The Christians had many advantages over them—joyous enthusiasm, consciousness of their communion with God, the sense of elevation above the world. If men wished to raise up enthusiastic opponents to Christianity they must purify the old faith from the notions which have brought it into contempt, and give it the advantages of Christianity. Thus arose the last form of the Greek philosophy, the first philosophy formed in opposition to Christianity, Neo-Platonism, founded by Ammonius

The Last Philosophy of Greece Saccas, who died in 241, and elaborated by his scholar, Plotinus, who died in 270. Much surprise has been caused by the hostility between Neo-Platonism and Christianity. As if anything but a struggle for life and death could prevail between the real faith and a substitute, pursuing the object of driving out the former! All religions, barbarian as well as the Jewish, are justified in so far as they strive towards the true religion. Christianity alone makes

no defence of this kind, for it proclaims itself the only true religion and denies the right of all others to exist. Thus all religions of the world might unite in Neo-Platonism, and unite in a struggle against Christianity.

Porphyry, who died in 304, the pupil of Plotinus, makes a further attempt to see if the Christians will not allow themselves to be drawn into the porticoes of the Neo-Platonists. He wrote fifteen books, the title of which is variously translated, "about the Christians" or "against the Christians." They might confidently continue, said Porphyry, to reverence their Founder, from whom they take their name, for He was a wise and holy man. But His disciples have altered the truths preached by Him and have made him a God against His will. The Christians must place no belief in their holy writings, for these contain contradictions and improbabilities.

The ill-success of such attempts at proselytism resulted merely in determining men not to shrink from quite other weapons in order to wipe Christianity from off the earth. The emperors after Philip the Arabian were filled with pain and **Decian Persecutions Begin** anger at the decay of the empire. Their object was to restore its old power and splendour, and for this unity in worship was essential. In 249 Decius mounted the throne. He first formed the plan of systematically extirpating Christianity. The system of espionage on the Christians set up by order of the state and forbidden by Trajan was now reinstated.

The decree of the year 250 ordered that throughout the empire the Christians were to be forced to take part in the state religion. The priests were to be immediately put to death as presumably incorrigible, the others to be made humble by continually increasing penalties. Heavy punishment would fall on the prefect who did not bring back the Christians of his district to the old religion. What a thunderbolt for the Christians! And it burst, too, on a community grown effeminate and full of half-Christians, owing to the entry of masses of the people. When, therefore, torture and death suddenly threatened, many acted as if they could not purify themselves quickly enough of the suspicion of being Christians. Others, with bleeding heart, consented to offer incense to the gods. Others, again, tried to extenuate their backsliding to



CHRISTIAN SOLDIERS DECLARING THEIR FAITH BEFORE DECIUS

When Decius came to the throne, in 249 A.D., he set himself to the extirpation of Christianity, but his harshest measures were unavailing, and many officers and soldiers in his army were not afraid to avow themselves Christians before him.

themselves by bribing the officials, in order to get a certificate that they had satisfied the imperial orders.

But, strange to say, many of those who separated themselves from the Christians by a definite renunciation were not yet in a position to return to the pagans. They wished themselves back in the community from which fear had driven them. They implored to be taken back. They knew that in that case they were again threatened by what only now they had been too weak to endure. They knew that they must undergo an ordeal of repentance, lasting, perhaps, many years in shame and privation, before they were again received into the Church, and enabled to suffer torture or death for their faith. And yet they could not do otherwise; they could not live without that which once had inspired them.

And by the side of the weak ones what proofs of heroism! The victims in Alexandria were not less numerous than in Rome. The constancy of the boy Dioscurus under all his torments was so great that even the governor, full of wonder and pity, set him free. In the Thebais a Christian and his wife hung for days on the cross, speaking words of encouragement to each other. In Jerusalem and Antioch the bishops died after enduring tortures manfully. At Carthage the prison was filled with Christians, whom the officials wished to force to renunciation through hunger and thirst. They were no longer content with the ordinary tortures, but devised new and ingenious torments.

It was the heroic endurance of the constant that exasperated them most. Formerly they thought they had conquered when they had shown their power over the life of the Christians. They now felt that there could be no talk of victory unless the Christians were brought to renounce their faith. The martyr who died bravely triumphed over agony, death and his murderers; only he who drew back from the instruments of torture or from death was a conquered man. This led to the new sort of warfare—to kill only those who could not be conquered themselves and encouraged others, but to compel the rest, by unwearying persistence and perpetually renewed torments, to abandon the castle of their faith. As if the enlightenment and humanity

of the age were ashamed of this brutality, a short period of tranquillity began with the death of Decius, in 251. And although Valerian (253–260), with the greatest resolution, planned the annihilation of the Christians, he first tried to attain his purpose by less ferocious means. The Christian communities were to be, as it were, spiritually starved out, in order that they might break up from internal weakness. The bishops were removed and all assemblies of Christians forbidden. Thus the law of 258 ordered that all bishops, presbyters and deacons, as well as senators and knights, should be executed if after confiscation of their property they did not give up their faith. Noble women were to be banished, Christians in the imperial service were to work in chains on the emperor's estates.

In this persecution Cyprian suffered death at Carthage. But though very many bishops and presbyters were slain, the desired object was not reached. When Valerian was taken captive by the Persians, his successor, Gallienus, gave up the profitless contest. For some forty years the Christians had rest. Their numbers once more grew mightily. There was no longer need to search for Christians—they were met everywhere. In the army there were Christian officers, among the servants of the state there were Christians up to the governors themselves; there were Christian courtiers round the emperor. Finally there was even a rumour that the wife and daughter of the emperor, Diocletian, wished to be baptised.

After 284, Diocletian was on the throne. He succeeded where his predecessors had failed in restoring strength and unity to the shattered empire. He was able to form the unwieldy Roman empire into an organised structure. A Neo-Platonic state Church was now the goal of the friends of unity. The Bithynian governor, Hierocles, especially sought to propagate this idea. He addressed two books of "truth-loving words to the Christians." The use of other means than words and truth, the exercise of rude force, to overcome the Christians, accorded but little with the lofty morality of the Neo-Platonist and his conception of the man's union with God. But what of the present time, when it appeared that words were in vain? If this noble virtue of Neo-Platonism could prevail universally only after annihilation

The Martyrs are the Victors bravely triumphed over agony, death and his murderers; only he who drew back from the instruments of torture or from death was a conquered man. This led to the new sort of warfare—to kill only those who could not be conquered themselves and encouraged others, but to compel the rest, by unwearying persistence and perpetually renewed torments, to abandon the castle of their faith. As if the enlightenment and humanity

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN BEING

of Christianity, were other weapons then to be shunned?

Hierocles found an enthusiastic helper in the emperor, Galerius. The emperor, it is true, was not ready for such a step; he was the son of a Dalmatian bond-woman and subject to the superstition of his race. To the question whether action should be taken against the Christians the oracle of Apollo at Miletus gave the answer that the Christians made it impossible to declare the truth. The emperor gave way to the pressure, insisting only that no blood should be shed. Galerius ventured to have the Christian church at Nicomedia stormed and destroyed by his prætorians in February, 303.

On the next day a decree was publicly posted up. All Christian churches were to be demolished, all Christian books burnt, every Christian meeting prohibited. All who persisted in the Christian faith were to lose their offices, and the free to become slaves. A Christian, carried away by indignation, tore down the decree. He was cruelly tortured and executed. Fire twice broke out in the imperial palace, and the blame was laid upon the Christians. Insurrections occurred in Armenia and Syria, and the Christians were supposed to have instigated them.

Thus the opposition of the emperor was overcome. The Christian officials of the court were required to abandon their faith. Their steadfastness irritated the emperor, so that his disinclination to shed blood soon disappeared. One decree followed another until the final

order that all Christians should be forced by every means to sacrifice. "If I had a hundred tongues, and every tongue of metal," writes a Christian author of those days, "they would not suffice to describe all the cruelties, to name all the tortures which were inflicted by the judges on the righteous and the unrighteous." The different methods of death, which men did not shrink to employ, cannot be recorded. The empire was drenched with streams of Christian blood. At times the arm of the

murderer appeared weary; but when in times of rest it was seen that all the previous fury had not led to any result, the enemies of Christianity gathered their strength again in order to end the war of annihilation. Their blind rage at their want of success led men to have recourse to the expedient of pouring the wine or water used at sacrifices over the articles of food in the market, so that the Christians who could not be compelled to sacrifice still tasted something of the sacrifice. The persecution lasted eight years.

Galerius, attacked by a dread disease, issued shortly before his death, in 311, a decree for the east of the empire, ordering the toleration of the Christian religion. He does not recognise them as privileged; his wish still is that the Christians should willingly return to the faith of their fathers. But he has seen that nothing is able to force them to it, and that the result of his efforts has been the reverse of that which he wished to attain. The Christians now show no reverence to any god; to his



BLANDINA, THE SLAVE GIRL

Her story is one of the most interesting among those of the early martyrs. Converted to Christianity by her mistress, she suffered a terrible ordeal by fire; and later, when exposed to the wild beasts, it is said they would not attack her; so she was hung in a net to be gored by a wild bull, but finally had to be despatched by the executioner.

gods because they do not choose, to their God because they do not dare. The interest of the state, requires the prayers of all for the state. It is thus to be arranged that "they become Christians again, and again hold their meetings for divine service," in order that they may pray to their God for the emperor and the empire. A toleration

**The State
Impotent Against
the Martyrs**

reluctantly conceded out of a feeling of personal impotence before this incomprehensible resistance of faith—that was what the dying man gave. The prisons were opened, the crowds of the tortured prisoners returned to their homes, welcomed even by the heathen "with pity and rejoicing."

In the west of the empire the emperor, Constantius Chlorus, had "contented himself with the destruction of the temple, but had spared the temple made of men." The victorious progress of his son Constantine caused the persecution gradually to cease throughout the whole west, and, in 313, gave to the Christian Church the edict of Milan, which surpassed all expectations. What made Constantine the liberator and patron of the Church? When he started from Gaul for the south his religion was probably nothing else than the vague monotheism of his era, which had kept his father from hating the Christians and venting his fury on them. Later it became a warm interest in Christianity, an unmistakable conviction of its truth. The dark stains in his moral life do not give us the right to consider him a conscious hypocrite.

For even the actual conviction of the truth of Christianity does not make it at all impossible that morality lagged behind knowledge, especially in a Roman emperor accustomed to boundless licence. That Constantine was baptised only on his death-bed was nothing unusual at a time when Christians thought to gain by baptism forgiveness only for their past sins, and the

**Constantine
Baptised on His
Death-bed**

necessity for the act might have been brought home the more to the emperor in that he was well aware of his moral deficiencies. The fact that, although long considered a Christian even by Christians, he did not wish to die without receiving baptism might be adduced as proof that he expected something from the Church for the next world; that he was concerned about the remission of his sins, and that, therefore, not mere political considerations

determined his attitude towards the Church.


When did Constantine first turn with interest to Christianity? Judging by the difference between the edict of 312 and that at the beginning of 313, his opinion must have altered during that interval. He bases his "intervention for the Christian Community" in the decree at Milan on the hope that in return "the divine favour, which he has experienced in such great things, will at all times bring him success and safety." He must, therefore, have already experienced God's help in such a way that it was clear to him God was for the Christians.

In support of this view we first find the cross as the badge under which Constantine fights and conquers in the war against Maxentius. And after his victory over his opponent he causes to be erected in Rome the statue of himself holding in his hand the cross as "the salvation-bringing badge under which he freed the city from the yoke of the tyrant." He could hardly have made this declaration merely out of political considerations, for he no longer needed to win the Christian

**The First
Victories of
the Cross**

for himself, and could only estrange the heathen by the act. But if the conviction had been forced on him before the battle with Maxentius that God was for the Christians, and that their cross was a salvation-bringing badge, we shall not have to relegate to the realm of legends what Eusebius is said to have learnt from the emperor himself on the subject. As he stood confronting his powerful opponent and meditated as to what god he should summon to help him, he received the order to conquer in the sign of the cross. Therefore, he looked with superstitious reverence on this symbol, and thought to gain God's favour for himself by showing favour to the Christians. His victories under the new banner strengthened him in this belief, so that in inward conviction also he approaches nearer and nearer to Christianity.

If we reflect how vastly predominant the pagans of the empire were at the accession of Constantine, and how the last terrible persecution had driven the Christians from all higher posts; if we reflect further how little he actually did for the repression of heathendom and for the supremacy of Christendom, his conviction that the future



SCENES IN THE CATACOMBS: THE REFUGE OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS

After martyrdom, nothing could better illustrate the vitality of their faith than the stupendous industry of the early Christians in constructing great underground cities in the Campagna, near Rome, where they could assemble in considerable bodies for the worship of God. These labyrinthine passages, going down three and four storeys into the earth, were at once cemeteries, churches, and places of refuge for the Christians, and were long used as burial places.

belonged to Christianity cannot be thus explained merely as a stroke of genius, but must rest on a firm belief of the superior strength of the Christian faith. And then also his hope that the religious unity in the empire to be obtained by Christianity would bring with it a civic unity would not seem a misuse of the Church for political ends. In reality, he never

An Era of Religious Liberty

wished to do more than to render it possible for the Church to develop all her forces absolutely unfettered, in the expectation that then paganism would decay and the state flourish.

This was the state of his mind when he issued the edict of Milan in 313. In concert with Licinius he conceded by it religious freedom for the entire Roman empire, and that not reluctantly, but rather considering his action as the only just course. The Roman state abandoned its former view that religion was an affair of state. Constantine relegated it to the sphere to which it belongs, according to Christian notions, the conscience. In acting in this manner he acted in the "interests of public peace." He recognised that the state can never be quiet if there is a living religious spirit present. Yet religion is, nevertheless, to be controlled by the state. For the sake of the public peace men had often and terribly wreaked their fury on Christianity, because it roused the conscience, and thereby created a spirit of intolerable independence. On the same grounds conscience was now declared to be free.

How had Christianity transformed the ideas of the old world! The emperors proclaim the principle laid down by Christ: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's." But if no one was to suffer from the fact that he was a Christian, the Christian Church must also be granted the same privileges which the previous state religion had enjoyed.

The Church Under State Protection

Constantine issued—first for his own dominions and then, after the conquest of his last opponent, Licinius in 234, for the whole empire—a series of laws, by which the Church became a protected and a favoured estate.

That which lately was hated as the deadly enemy of the state was now formed into a most important element in the organism of the public life. The priests were freed from public burdens, especially from the

oppressive services and payments in kind and from the liability of filling the municipal offices. The property of the Church was secured by the grant of corporate rights to the Church, and was increased not merely by donations from the emperor but also by the legal decision that legacies in favour of the Church were valid. The law recognised the right of the bishops to act as judges over members of their communities in civil matters and fully to exercise the power of punishing their priests. The privilege of sanctuary was also conceded to Christian churches.

Sunday was recognised as a holy day, on which public state affairs—for instance, law suits—were to be suspended. The state gave the force of law to resolutions passed by the Church and lent its authority to aid in carrying them out. Something of the Christian spirit already entered into the secular legislature. The face of man, created in the image of God, was no more to be branded. The criminal who had forfeited his life was no longer to be despatched in a cruel fashion by crucifixion or by being torn in pieces by the teeth of wild beasts. Children might no longer

be sold. How great a change! There had been times when the Christians would have feared such rich gifts as a gift of the

Danai. Now the Church was confessedly Catholic. Just now it had been prostrate under the headman's axe. Men could only rejoice. We must pardon the Christians who lived to see this change if Constantine seemed to them "as a heavenly messenger sent by God," and if they could not see his stains because the glory which the Church had gained through him dazzled their eyes.

Constantine also gave the Church that which up till now it had lacked sadly, a formal bond of unity. The cardinal point of the Church's rule of faith was the acknowledgment of "Jesus Christ, begotten Son of God, our Lord." Granted that at first men assented to this profession as taken from the writings of primitive times in the Church, and as corresponding to the Christian consciousness of the incomparable majesty of the Saviour, yet as decades of peace came (since about 180) and the number of educated men in the Church increased, the necessity must have been felt of determining definitely what was expressed and what excluded by those phrases.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN BEING

Say that Christians exulted because they had vanquished polytheism and had found the one God; would not this conquest be endangered by the other proposition that Christ, Son of God, *was* God? Some thought that the unity of God could only be maintained by the assumption that the one God had taken human form in Christ, and as such was called "Son of God." Others did not wish Christ to be taken as God himself. The latter view especially was contested and rejected. But when the Church finally obtained peace under Constantine, the presbyter Arius in Alexandria renewed this false doctrine in a form which somewhat more closely approached the view of the Church. Christ, he said, was not a mere man, but the manifestation of a higher spiritual Being, created by God, and, therefore, in its nature unlike (*ἀνόμοιος*) to God.

The flames of this dispute blazed brightly. Constantine saw it with deep sorrow. He had hoped that in the future the one religion which he thought the best would prevail in the entire Roman empire, and that through it the unity of the empire would be firmly established. Now, the adherents of this religion which

**The First
Œcumenical
Council**

was to heal all divisions were divided! He implored the Church at Alexandria, in a letter, to desist from such disputes over secondary points, but in vain. How was this concord to be restored? Only a general conference of all the bishops could lead to the desired end. The emperor resolved to make this possible and to summon an imperial synod. Thus, he invited attendance at the meeting and defrayed the expenses of the delegates out of the public treasury.

From June to August, 325, this first "Œcumenical Council" sat at Nicæa in Bithynia. Among the three hundred and eighteen members, some of whom were present only for a part of the time, there were a Persian and a Gothic bishop; from the west, which was less agitated by this dispute, naturally few (six) appeared. At the opening, and more than once during the conferences, Constantine himself spoke, in order to urge peace. And after the terrible storms of the persecutions—many of those present still bore conspicuous traces on their bodies of the torments they had endured—the sunshine of imperial favour was too sweet to allow all present to maintain their independence.


Constantine was not to blame if "for the sake of peace and out of regard for the imperial will" even those who did not find their own conviction expressed in the final confession of faith (Christ is consubstantial with the Father: *ὁμοούσιος*) declared themselves satisfied with it. Only two bishops supported Arius in opposition. The emperor gave to the resolutions of the synod the force of law. The opposite view was, therefore, illegal, and banishment was inflicted on those who refused to abandon it.

In this manner the Church arrived at an outward expression of the unity of the episcopacy, so long desired. The community which had formerly been held together only by the bond of the same faith, the same love, the same hope, had now become the imperial Church, possessing a uniform outward government. Thus the question whether one bishop should be regarded as first among all was put for the moment into the background. The matter was not pressing.

In this first general council neither the bishop of Rome—his advanced age prevented him from taking part—nor the presbyters representing him presided. It is true that the bishop of Rome had been granted the primacy over the churches of the political diocese of Rome—that is, over the greatest part of Central Italy and all Lower Italy, with Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, but nothing more. Would this state of things continue? Would the successors of Constantine refrain as much as he did from direct interference in the internal affairs of the Church? Would not a Church which had already so thoroughly carried out the principle of rank and subordination be in the end forced to declare above all others one bishop, who should maintain himself absolutely independent in the face of worldly potentates? But Rome had already found a rival. The

**The
Rival of
Rome**

emperor had removed his court to the town in the east bearing his name. If the Roman community acquired its high reputation, as there is no doubt, chiefly because it lay in the centre of the empire, would not the bishop of the new capital be still more highly exalted by the splendour of the Christian emperor? Or perhaps, on the contrary, the very proximity of the emperor will prevent him from soaring so high.



THE BURIAL OF THE MARTYRS IN THE CATACOMBS OF THE CAMPAGNA. NEAR ROME



THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED

ROME'S LONG FIGHT FOR THE PRIMACY

AND THE SPLIT BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

OWING to Constantine, the Church had become the favoured religious body. Nothing now deterred men from entering it; much attracted men strongly towards it. There was some difficulty in keeping aloof from it. The dykes, as it were, that protected it were broken through, and, unhindered, the turbid floods of those who were strange to the true religious spirit poured in. This, indeed, did not make the Church really poorer in Christian spirit, but immeasurably richer in unworthy members. To govern them so that they might all lead a life worthy of the Christian name was completely impossible.

The unholy "world" spread within the "Holy Church." The more earnest spirits were roused to protest all the more energetically against this unchristian life by the impressive eloquence of acts. The hour struck for the birth of monasticism.

How the Monasteries Began

Christianity required self-renunciation and the subdual of sinful desires. The more thorough the abhorrence felt by a Christian snatched from pagan immorality for intemperance and shameless licence, the more easily could he bring himself to keep as far as possible from everything which the pagans boldly misused; and he could even find honour in denying himself such things as were not exactly forbidden, simply because natural desire impelled him to them. By the middle of the second century it could be pronounced as a universal Christian view that marriages were to be entered into not out of sexual inclination, but merely for the purpose of giving birth to children.

To enter into a second marriage after the death of the husband was regarded by many as "respectable adultery," on the ground chiefly that natural desires might be excused in youth, but not in riper years. The highest merit, however, consisted in total abstention from sexual intercourse.

Such views were able to mislead persons to exhibit fanciful displays of self-denial. Ascetic maidens ventured to live with men of like feeling on such intimate terms that their virginity, preserved in spite of great temptations, revealed a laudable victory of the spirit over the flesh. Originally, indeed, such restraint was valued only as an exercise, which was intended to strengthen the will power for the battle against sin. But because such acts were a proof of the earnestness of the feeling it might only too easily be thought that they were also in themselves meritorious practices; that the greatest possible subjection of natural desire and absence of passion was true Christianity.

In quiet years between periods of persecution there came to the Church many members of whom such self-denial could not be expected, and whom the Church did not wish to reject. A twofold code of morality was then formulated. Under the complete code men abstained from marriage and abjured earthly possessions in order to serve God alone. Under the other, men lived the ordinary life of the world, but avoided in it what was forbidden by God.

It was supposed that this distinction was to be found in the Holy Scriptures of the early Christian time. The former code of morality followed the advice of the evangelists; the latter only the commandments. But since the masses flowed into the Church, and with them came that immorality which formerly was seen only among the pagans, even the original form of the higher code of morality no longer seemed to the more earnest spirits a sufficient protest against the worldly feeling. The former ascetics had still remained in the body of the Church and of the state; but now men wished by open rupture with the worldly life, ruled by

The Revolt Against Worldliness

natural desires, to proclaim aloud that true Christianity despises the world. Flight from the world was put forward as the ideal. This belief certainly brought a blessing with it.

The enthusiasm for monasticism, which was awakened by the growth of immorality in the Church, was a constant

**The Days
of the
Hermits**

protest against corruption, and prevented it from establishing itself in the Church and completely ruining it. For many, too, who dreaded a relapse into the pagan ways, life in circles permeated with unchristian practices must have proved too strong a temptation. They had cause to fear for their Christianity if they remained in the old, and yet now so new, surroundings. Hence came that longing to withdraw into solitude even in those who ventured later to face again the storm of life. But, on the other hand, how greatly must the general conception of life have been influenced if such renunciation of the world was praised as the highest ideal, if the highest worth of Christianity consisted in contempt for the world! Neo-Platonism had not been able to conquer Christianity, either by learned writings or through brute force. But it had infused its spirit into its deadly enemy.

At first there were individuals who took refuge in the solitude of the Libyan desert and lived as hermits for the sake of contemplation only. The example of Egypt was soon followed by Palestine, Syria, Armenia, Pontus, Cappadocia. Nothing was more natural than that the fame of some specially holy anchorite—as, for example, Anthony, who died in 356—should induce other refugees from the world to settle in his neighbourhood. Thus were formed the monastic villages, the *Lauræ*. They met for common prayer and singing. But why should each individual have his own hut? Was it not simpler if a considerable number lived together in one

**The First
of the
Brotherhoods**

house? Pachomius first suggested this. About the year 340 he founded on Tabennæ, an island in the Nile, a monastery which soon obtained great renown. Naturally a rule had to be prescribed for such a brotherhood. Pachomius instituted a uniform dress, common meals, fixed times for prayer, and required a vow of obedience to the head.

Dangerous results of the hermit life soon appeared, not only in licentiousness and

coarseness, but also in the rise of new religious errors. Monasticism was hardly formed when it threatened to create a religious society, standing in opposition to the mass of the Church. The fruits of the view of "the worldly," which prevailed in the Church, were now reaped.

The Euchetes in Mesopotamia wished only to pray and beg. If it was perfection to possess nothing, then the most perfect thing was not to call anything one's own even for the briefest moment, and, therefore, not to earn anything by work. If praying was something higher than work, the highest thing was never to work, always to pray; and if such a monastic life was perfection, there was no longer any need of the former means of attaining perfection, of a divine law, of the Bible, of the Sacraments. In such errors the Church found no perfect realisation of her teachings, but only a caricature of her own new ideas. Yet centuries elapsed before she quite eradicated them by persecution.

Another important movement originated with Eustathius of Sebaste—in Little Armenia—and spread to the neighbouring districts of Asia Minor. If

**Extremes
of Religious
Fanaticism**

celibacy was a higher state than marriage with its gratification of the natural impulse, then marriage was emphatically sin, and no married man could be saved. If all earthly possessions, all ornaments, all comfort, were something impure, then those only would be saved who abandoned all that was earthly. Thus women were not even permitted to wear the natural ornament of their hair or female dress, but had to crop their heads and put on men's clothes. A Church which did not appreciate all this was a worldly Church.

The Apostolicans wished to restore the apostolic life, declared property, theft, and marriage, sin. The Audians in Mesopotamia, Palestine, and Arabia blamed the Church for falling away from the true Christianity, because the monastic ideal was not realised by all in it. Even the author of the *Panarion*, the apothecary's chest, in which the antidote to eighty heresies is to be found, the strictly orthodox Epiphanius, who died in 403, stands as if lost in admiration at the sanctity of these Audians—so uncertain was the attitude of the Church towards these fanatical exponents of asceticism. Indeed, the Church could have admired

THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED

even the most incredible caricatures if this contempt for the earthly had not become an attack on itself. The well-known Simeon Stylites in Northern Syria first established a fame for fasting. He abstained from all food so long that he was at the point of death. Then he had an enclosure prepared and lay therein, fastened to a chain. At last they had to erect a pillar on this spot, on the summit

tility to the Church, induced at last the more thoughtful—as Basil of Cappadocia, who died in 379—to devote themselves to the task of making the anchorites conform to a regulated cloister life and maintain some connection with the official Church. They also endeavoured to get the monasteries removed from the deserts into the vicinity of the towns, a measure which led the monks to join in ecclesiastical

disputes and to carry their own views by the reputation of their sanctity and occasionally by the use of their fists.

While some thus conceived asceticism to be the essence of monasticism, others emphasised in monasticism the opportunity for contemplation and observation of the inner condition of the soul. Individuals had withdrawn from the world, in order to purify more thoroughly the inner self and to raise it to God. They were obliged to think over the ways which led to union with God. This prepared the way for the monastic mysticism which was afterwards zealously practised, and which developed into an independent movement.

As the first mystic we may mention Macarius, who died in 391, founder of the monastery in the Scetic desert, if he was really the author of the fifty homilies which pass under his name.

In a somewhat later period the holy Nilus is conspicuous; he was born at Constantinople, gave up his high post, entrusted his wife and daughter to an Egyptian monastery, and settled with his son as an anchorite on Mount Sinai, and died after 430. We possess some ascetic writings of his and some two thousand letters, which, in the form of maxims, praise the splendour of the monastic life and the abandonment of the world as leading to the freedom of the soul and to its union with God.



THE HERMIT AT HIS DEVOTIONS

When the Church began to flourish as an organisation, great masses of people with no genuine spirituality were swept into it. Many withdrew from it and became hermits; and, later, bodies of such men formed monastic communities, in which unchristian qualities speedily developed, until there was little to choose between the worldliness of the Church and the extravagances of the hermits.

of which he spent some thirty years. Both the pagan Bedouins and the Christians honoured him most highly; even in Rome small statues of him were in demand as objects of great value. A large number of others imitated his hazardous feat. Soon everyone lost the courage to blame such conduct.

But the extravagances of monasticism in particular, amounting almost to hos-

Owing to the new position in which Constantine placed the Church, the Christians had rest, and with it time and desire to celebrate feasts. The Church wished to make its life attractive and impressive to the masses and to give them a substitute for the joyous and glittering pagan feasts, of which they

Beginning of the Church Feasts had been deprived since their conversion to Christianity. Formerly, besides the Sunday, only the Easter feast, in remembrance of Christ's death and resurrection, was celebrated. Then in the east the feast of the Epiphany on January 6th had been introduced (first in commemoration of Christ's baptism).

The west now gave to the whole Church a far more beautiful feast. On December 24th, the feast of the Sigillaria, the pagans were wont to give the children dolls and images of wax or earthenware or dough, and the next day they kept the "birthday of the invincible sun." The Church declared this day the birthday of Him whom all the dark storms of persecution had not been able to conquer. This feast, which is traceable in the west after 354, was introduced into Constantinople in 379. To the fortieth day after Christmas, February 2nd, they assigned the feast of "the Purification of Mary," or "Candlemas," since the holy candles were then consecrated. Thus a Christian festival replaced the February lustrations, in particular the Amburbale (procession round the city), with its procession of torches.

Further feasts were created to meet a similar spiritual longing. Paganism had been proud of its heroes, had sacrificed at their graves, and celebrated their festivals. Their place was taken by the religious martyrs, whose *natalitia*, or birthday feasts, in commemoration of their death as the entry into the true life, became real, popular festivals with the

Martyrs Replace the Heroes of Paganism customary feasting. Theodoretus could boast before the former pagans: "The Lord has introduced his dead, instead of your gods, into the temple. They are, in truth, the leaders, the champions, and helpers in need." Formerly the Christians had assembled for divine service at the tombs of the martyrs, in order to gain strength for the war of faith in which all shared. Now these assemblies developed into a celebration of the

martyred heroes, redounding to the glory of the Church. Chapels and churches were erected over their graves. Their remains were sought out; their relics were taken into the church in solemn procession, to be laid beneath the altar.

If men had formerly prayed for the dead with the feeling that those who have departed hence are still bound by love with those left behind, they began now to pray to them as to heavenly agents, who from heaven protect mankind below. But if these saints were near at hand to help, where could they be nearer than where their remains were to be seen? Thus all sorts of wonders were wrought by the relics; and the half-pagan masses felt proud and safe, because they belonged to a communion in which such exalted patrons were revered. The trade in relics became so profitable a business that in the year 386 the emperor Theodosius was obliged to forbid men by law to dig up the bones of the saints and carry them away for sale.

It might be surprising to find that there was not yet any talk of an adoration of Mary, the mother of Jesus; but at that time the remembrance of the bloody persecutions was still so vivid that the martyrs were held by the Church to be stars of special glory in heaven. The mother of the Lord lacked the martyr's crown. But the way which led later to the adoration of Mary had long since been open. While Tertullian, who died about 220, assumed, as certain earlier Christians did, that Jesus had had brothers of the flesh, Epiphanius, who died in 403, already opposed the representatives of this view as heretics, led astray by the old serpent. Mary's virginity had not been injured even by Christ's birth. While Chrysostom, who died in 407, still upheld the possibility of blame in her, Augustine, who died in 430, thinks that with her (though with her alone) there can be no question of sin.

Thus she might co-operate in the work of redemption, and was, therefore, exalted, like her son, Christ. The Holy Scriptures, indeed, mention nothing of this, but that was not fatal. "The Ascension of Mary" was produced and ascribed to the apostle John; in soul and body had she been taken up into heaven, and the high privilege of being invoked for help had been solemnly assured to her by Christ himself.


THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED

If she had thus been placed at the side of the Son of God as the mother of God, then she must have her high festivals, as He did. Each of the next centuries added a fresh one. They celebrated the day of the Annunciation, the day on which she came with her Child into the temple for "purification," her assumption, her birth. Even the angels were clothed with divine powers for protection. Their aid was invoked, and a special day was consecrated as a festival to the archangel Michael.

It was sought to offer a Christian substitute for the fading classical education. The quiet in the external world gave

make a deep impression on the great world. It was desired to give the people, who delighted in spectacles, some compensation for the solemn pageants in which they had found pleasure at the high festivals of Dionysus, Athena, and others of their favourites. Thus the Church began to unfold her splendour in processions. Joyful events and public disasters alike offered an opportunity. The joy and sorrow of the people are placed in the beneficent hand of the Church.

The buildings for divine service could now be erected and beautified so as to inspire those who stood outside with



ART IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH

As the Church developed into settled communities, and buildings were consecrated to worship, the ancient pagan temples being chiefly used for this purpose, rude Christian art began, particularly in mosaic. The favourite subject was the enthronement of Christ, as here seen in one of the sixth century mosaics at St. Sophia, Constantinople. Christ is in the act of blessing, and the words on the book in His left hand read: "Peace be with you! I am the Light of the world." The emperor bows at His feet, and the medallions contain images of Mary and Michael.

leisure for composition, and the educated men, now become Christians, felt the need of poetic literature. Apollonius of Laodicea, who died in 390, sang of the sacred history as far as King Saul in an epic of twenty-four books, and imitated with Biblical subjects the tragedies of Euripides, the comedies of Menander, and the lyrics of Pindar. Ephraim the Syrian, who died in 378, composed nearly all his writings in poetical form in peculiar lines of seven syllables each.

The Church, which had so long been pushed aside into a corner, ventured to let herself be seen in the open marketplace of the world, and wished now to

a sense of the greatness of the Church, and those who entered with a feeling of her power, extended over the world. It is characteristic that Constantine most eagerly encouraged the extension and the improvement of the existing Church buildings and the erection of new ones, because up till now they had not been suitably restored, from fear of persecution. The amelioration in the condition of the Church was followed by the improvement of the churches.

Art was called in to aid. At first, indeed, the wish to influence the masses by art had to contend with the repugnance to the pictorial representation of the divine

Being—a custom with which paganism had been reproached. But were not these pictures a silent sermon for the ignorant people? Gradually even those who were still biassed by the old ideas became accustomed to the innovation.

About the year 440 men acquired courage enough to introduce pictures of Christ himself into the churches, not, as before, merely under emblems, such as the lamb, the shepherd, or the fish. And it is noteworthy that He was no longer represented, as was formerly done in the catacombs, as a beardless youth, but as the King of Heaven in full majesty and sometimes with a halo round his head, as was customary with pagan emperors. How should not the still half-pagan people show to these pictures the same honour as formerly to the statues of their gods? Men prostrated themselves before them, kissed them, offered incense to them, and lighted lamps before them. Why should not these pictures work wonders also? Ought the Church to prohibit such a proof of reverence for the Holy One? At a time when men must have thought that much had been attained, ought they not to have rejoiced if all the so-called Christians could only be maintained in concord with the Church?

Since the Church succeeded so splendidly in making her cult pleasant, interesting, and comfortable to her new members, there remained only two reasons that caused some still to adhere to the obsolete system of paganism and delayed its complete disappearance. The old Roman spirit had been too closely bound up with the old gods. In Rome itself the friends of the mother country thought that the glory of the empire would be destroyed if the religion under the protection and guidance of which the world had been conquered were to die out. How much more quickly did the remnants of paganism disappear in the new capital, which knew no sanctified traditions, but arose under the eyes of a Christian emperor!

Christians in Power

The second hindrance to the complete victory of Christianity was the anxiety lest classical culture should disappear, together with the old belief in the gods. For this reason the places where this culture was fostered held tenaciously to the old order of things; Athens, Miletus, Ephesus, Nicomedia, Antioch. The hos-

tility of these groups to Christianity could only increase as the sons of Constantine proceeded to violent measures against paganism, being spurred on by Christians who had only too soon forgotten how urgently their fathers or even they themselves had formerly demanded religious liberty. What a source of grief it was for the enthusiastic friends of classical times, and to what obstinate resistance they must have been driven, when revered temples were demolished, works of art annihilated, the monuments of a glorious past destroyed, in order to establish the undisputed supremacy of an unenlightened religion! Was no return to the good old times still possible?

Julian (331-363) ventured to entertain this hope. He tried to stay and to overthrow the triumphal car of Christianity. He had become acquainted with Christianity in a sad form, clothed in the mask of hypocrisy, for at the imperial court those who indisputably possessed no trace of Christian faith tried, nevertheless, to get the start of each other in exhibiting their burning zeal for the Church. Julian was convinced that the number of the Christians would diminish if the sunshine of imperial favour no longer smiled on them, and if the might of the imperial arm no longer stood at the disposal of the Church.

Julian's Futile Effort to Restore the Ancient Gods

Just as he had too little confidence in Christianity, he had too much in paganism. He did not doubt it would shine out again with its old brilliancy if only complete freedom were restored to it. In point of fact he was able to secure many converts. A smile of the former emperors had sufficed to convert masses to Christianity, and to make these once more pagans did not even require a smile on the part of Julian. It was quite enough if they knew that he wished it. Now they were no longer Christians, but none the more pagans. The emperor was in despair at their lukewarmness in the service of the gods, at their disinclination to visit the temples, at their lack of moral rectitude.

He, therefore, wished to reform paganism; but he could only borrow from Christianity the means for so doing. The religious meetings of the pagans were to be organised similarly to the Christian divine services. The priesthood was to be cleansed of unworthy members. The charitable character of Christianity was

THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED

to be imitated, hospitals and almshouses were to be erected, and the needy were to be supported. He worked with all his energies, but he found no fellow-workers. The classic spirit would not revive. He had to go further than he had wished. If anywhere Christians were oppressed or killed by pagans, he let it pass unnoticed. When he started on the war against the Persians, he is said to have threatened to employ other measures against Christianity if he came back safely from the campaign. What else was left for him to do? As he fell, wounded by an arrow, while retreating from the enemy on the

of separation formed by the diversity of religion throughout the empire it was necessary to be content with a merely formal adhesion to the Christian Church, and not to shrink from strong measures, in order to establish unity. It was inevitable from this that the old paganism continued under the cloak of Christianity, and that Christianity was more and more strongly tinged with paganism.

Men had gone too far away from the spirit of the first Christians, according to which the essence of Christianity consisted in the communion of the individual with God. From being a "community of the



INTERIOR OF THE CHURCH OF ST. PAUL AT ROME, SHOWING ANCIENT MOSAICS

The church of St. Paul without the Walls is one of the oldest of the basilicas in Rome, though it has been much restored. The mosaics over the altar are among the most ancient Christian work in existence, dating from the fifth century.

battle-field, he is said to have exclaimed: "Nazarene, Thou hast conquered!" His words may not have run thus literally, but the phrase expresses the impression which his fall made on the contemporary world. The last attempt to re-establish paganism had failed; and not from incidental causes. Paganism had shown itself to be dead beyond the possibility of revival by any power.

But it was also impossible to realise the other ideal—to imbue the entire Roman empire with the Christian spirit and through it to cause the still existing paganism to disappear. To overthrow the wall

faithful" the Church had become an educational institution, and had received into herself such masses of persons needing education that, at times, the real goal of this education seemed forgotten, and she professed herself content if she obtained to some extent outward obedience.

And because this task was made more difficult by the existence of paganism she was obliged to aim at the complete eradication of the latter. Theodosius I., eastern emperor from 378, ruler of the entire empire from 392 to 395, worked for this object. He forbade visits to the temples and declared every sort of idolatry to be high treason.

In 394 the Olympian games were celebrated for the last time. His son continued his work. Bishops and numbers of monks were sent into the provinces to destroy the old shrines. In Alexandria the celebrated teacher of philosophy, Hypatia, perished at the hands of the Christian mob. Pagans were excluded from posts in the government and army.

The last bulwark of classic paganism, the school at Athens, was closed by Justinian in the year 529. The teachers emigrated to Persia. About 545, at the emperor's commission, John, bishop of Ephesus, went about in order to track out the pagans "wherever they were still to be found." He prided himself on having made in Asia 70,000 Chris-

tians. How long, however, the worship of the gods, which many loved, defied the imperial legislation in the provinces the temple of Isis at Philæ in Upper

Paganism in the Sixth Century Egypt shows; it was not closed until the middle of the sixth century. The conviction that outside the one visible

Church there was no salvation had become universal. The attempt to make of the Church a firmly articulated organism had been successful. The state had lent its arm to uphold the single will of the Church against personal independence. But, strangely enough, the result was not only the defection of large groups from the Church, but also its division into two parts, which, in spite of repeated attempts, could not be reunited. This development was due chiefly, first, to the wish to see the unity of the visible Church confirmed by the creation of a permanent head, raised above all other members, and, secondly, to the intervention of the powerful arm of the state, which had been invoked to protect the unity of the Church. The former cause was especially active in the West, the latter grievance especially prevalent in the East.

The Council of Nicæa had not really quenched the flames of the Arian heresy, for the majority of those present had voted against their conviction in order

to please the emperor. When they returned home they repented and sought to convince the emperor that Arius was by no means a wicked heretic, and that it would never be possible to restore unity in the Church on the basis of the resolutions passed at Nicæa. One of the ecclesiastics at court was well disposed towards Arianism. He worked upon the emperor's sister, and she succeeded in changing her brother's attitude. Athanasius of Alexandria, the great opponent of Arianism, was banished. But the sudden death of

Arius prevented his being received back into the body of the Church. When Constantius mounted the throne Athanasius was permitted to return; but before long the Arians

were able to bring about his second deposition. The imperial governor at Alexandria was obliged to employ force to instal

the successor of Athanasius in office. Scourging and imprisonment were the lot of those discontented with the act. Was there no one now in the whole of Christendom

to take under his protection the persecuted representative of orthodoxy? For a long time the community at Rome had possessed special repute among Christians, for, indeed, all the world had been accustomed to look with reverence to the ancient capital of the world as the source of all imperial laws and ordinances and as the ultimate court of appeal in all civil questions. In disputed questions men could not help considering what the community at Rome thought on the debated point. Questions had been

submitted. Men did not always follow the answer they received; but, nevertheless, they had not ceased to inquire, in the hope that Rome would be on their side.



ATHANASIUS

For nearly fifty years bishop of Alexandria and the unwearied opponent of Arianism, maintaining devotedly the divinity of Christ. Athanasius died 373 A.D.



AUGUSTIN OF HIPPO

This bishop was one of the greatest of the early Christian writers, and intimate with pagan philosophy. He died in the year 430 A.D.

THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED

The bishop of Rome had the courage to take up the cause of the banished Athanasius; Julius I. and a Roman council definitely accepted his doctrine. The East held a rival council at Antioch—the first beginning of the schism. Men wished rather to settle the controversy. A general council met at Sardica in 343, but the members could not agree. The supporters of Arianism left the town. Those who remained behind wished to testify their gratitude to the Roman bishop, Julius, and to express the confidence which they reposed in him.

They therefore passed the resolution that bishops deposed by provincial synods might appeal to him. This concession was made to him personally, and only in that period of immediate distress was a harbour of refuge sought. The world soon forgot the resolution. Rome has never forgotten it, and has interpreted it to mean

What Rome Has Never Forgotten that the Roman throne is the highest court of appeal in all ecclesiastical questions. In addition, there was the fortunate incident that the resolutions of the Council of Sardica were confused in western assemblies with the rules laid down by the Council of Nicæa. Rome applied them, therefore, as resolutions of that famous first œcumenical council. The Arians who had seceded from the Council of Sardica expelled the Roman bishop from the body of the Church. Athanasius himself was forced more than once to go into exile.

The emperor, Valens (364-378), proceeded to measures of unexampled severity against all who would not become strict Arians. All this could have no other consequence but to enhance the importance of the Roman throne, until at last the view represented by it and maintained in defiance of all emperors gained the victory at the second œcumenical council at Constantinople in 381. The fact that the eastern

Church and the bishop of the new imperial capital had not been able to act freely, but were guided by the caprice of the emperor, made it more easy for the Roman bishop

to press on unchecked to his goal, the primacy. If in any question bishops turned to Rome for historical information on the subject, the Roman bishop did not deliver an opinion, but rendered a decision, as if he had been appealed to as judge. He issued a "decretal." Or if he held a synod on some question he communicated to other Churches the resolution passed in a form as if they also had to comply with it. Such communications were, perhaps, not always treated with due respect. But there they were, and could be employed by later bishops

of Rome as proof that for a very long time the "apostolic throne" had been accustomed to issue regulations for other Churches. Innocent I. (402-417) followed

The Exile of John Chrysostom

this line of policy with signal success. In Constantinople Byzantinism was flourishing once more. The great orator and austere preacher of morality, whom the people highly honoured, John Chrysostom, was obnoxious to the imperial court, and especially to the empress herself. He was sent into exile in 404.

Innocent dared to intervene for him and to demand his recall. The answer, indeed, was an imperial order to send the exile still further into the desert, and the noble Chrysostom sank beneath the exertions of this journey. But thirty years later it was recognised what injustice had been done him. The emperor, Theodosius II., had his bones brought to Constantinople. When the coffin was brought to land the emperor fell on his knees before it and implored pardon for the sins his deceased

parents had committed against the innocent man. The beloved remains were laid in the imperial vault. What a triumph for the bishop of Rome! He was the



JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

The great preacher of Constantinople, for whom Innocent I. declared against the emperor Valens, and to whose remains the emperor Theodosius II. paid reverence.



CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

A great figure in the war of the doctrines and opponent of Nestorius.

champion of innocence when no one dared to speak, and God in the end justified him before the whole world.

A new doctrinal dispute was kindled over the question as to how far salvation depended on a man's own exertions. Pelagius advanced the proposition that man, being free, can choose the good and fight his way through to holiness, and that the grace of God only rendered it more easy for him to realise his high destiny. Against him rose up the greatest and most influential of all the fathers of the Church, Aurelius Augustinus, bishop of Hippo Regius in Numidia, who died in 430. According to him, true freedom consists in the ability to attain one's destined development. The sinful man no longer possesses this liberty, and only the grace of God can redeem him and make him holy. Pelagius turned to the east. There the view prevailed that the divine grace and human freedom co-operated in the conversion of any man.

Two synods in Palestine declared themselves for Pelagius, but Innocent of Rome decided against him. Augustine held this up in triumph before his opponent, "Roma locuta, causa finita" (Rome has spoken, the dispute is decided). He may only have meant by this that if the "apostolic throne" had declared the teaching of Pelagius to be an innovation, it could not belong to the teachings of the old Church, but still Rome could henceforth make good use of this saying as evidence coming from the greatest of all churchmen, that Rome had the right to speak the last word in all ecclesiastical disputes.

Nevertheless, though the Church had laid this splendid foundation for the establishment of the primacy, certain of its members disputed the supremacy of Rome. This was seen again in this very dispute. Zosimus, the successor of Innocent, was firmly convinced that Pelagius was no

heretic. He blamed the African bishops for having attacked a man of so perfect faith. But these, under the guidance of Augustine at a council at Carthage in 418, openly declared their opposition to this decision of the bishop of Rome and gained the victory, so that in the end even Zosimus condemned Pelagius. The victors, however, were soon made harmless. In 428 the Vandals crossed over to Africa, and not only ravaged the

beautiful land, but also rendered the Church powerless. Rome was freed of its most powerful rival in the west.

In the east at that time the attempt was being made to reduce to fixed formulas the doctrine concerning the person of Christ and of the union of the divine and the human in Him. Two theological schools had tried their ingenuity on the question. The Alexandrians set out to establish the redemption as a divine act, and, therefore, emphasised the divine nature in Christ; their war-cry became the designation of the mother of Jesus as "Parent of God" (*theotokos*). Their opponents of the school of Antioch taunted them with the denial of the true humanity of the Redeemer.

The main thought by which they were led was a moral one. The Redeemer is for us the type of moral union with God. But He can be that only if a free moral development of His humanity remains possible. Thus they laid every stress on His humanity. The union of the divine and the human in Him is only a moral one—in the same way that God dwells in other pious men. Their

opponents retorted that they did not observe the essential difference between the Redeemer and the redeemed. Nestorius, the patriarch of Constantinople, had come from this school of Antioch. In sermons he fought against the shibboleth, "Parent of God." Against him rose Cyril of Alexandria. In order to win a powerful ally, he turned to the bishop of Rome with the declaration that, "according to ancient custom in the Church inquiry must be made at Rome in the case of disputed questions." Celestine I. listened gladly and demanded a recantation from Nestorius.

The emperor, Theodosius II., thereupon called the third œcumenical council at Ephesus in 431. Cyril and his supporters declared Nestorius deposed, and the Roman envoys confirmed the sentence. The opposite party replied by deposing Cyril and his friends. Both sides turned to the emperor. At last, in 432, the majority agreed to a formula which attempted to cut away the most irreconcilable points in the two doctrines. Nestorius was given up to the revenge of his enemies, and died in misery. The result of this dispute was the severance of the Nestorians from the imperial Church. In the year 440 Leo I. became bishop of

THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED

Rome, and his reign of twenty-one years was devoted to the one object of accustoming the world to the belief that the successor of Peter was the head of entire Christendom. Whoever ventured to desert the rock, Peter, lost connection with Christ and had no part in the kingdom of God. The views of the Alexandrians were represented in their most crude and exaggerated form by Eutyches, the old archimandrite of Constantinople. Christ, he taught, after His incarnation had but *one* nature, His humanity having been, as it were, swallowed up by His divinity.

Eutyches was deposed at a synod at Constantinople held under the patriarch Flavian. He appealed to Rome, as did Flavian. Leo I. demanded an exact report, in order that he might decide by virtue of the apostolic authority. He decided in his famous "Letter to Flavian" against Eutyches, and thus against monophysitism. But the east did not wish to allow itself to be ruled by Rome. The emperor called a council at Ephesus in 449, and entrusted the post of president to the successor of Cyril, the

passionate and unscrupulous Dioscurus of Alexandria, the patron of Eutyches. His intimidating appearance prevented the Roman envoys from securing an audience, the doctrine of Eutyches was ratified, and all its opponents, even Leo of Rome, were declared to be deposed. The emperor approved of these resolutions. The party which at this "synod of bandits" was in the minority fell back all the more on the support of the bishop of Rome, declaring more and more strongly that the decision lay with him. The end of the burning dispute was that at the council at Chalce-


don in 451, which condemned Nestorius as well as Eutyches, Leo's "Letter to Flavian" was made the basis of the decision. The feeling which this victory of the Roman throne produced is shown by the rise of the legend that Leo had placed his letter on the tomb of St. Peter and prayed that he would change anything wrong that was contained in it, and that on the next morning an alteration by the apostle's hand had been actually found.

But the supporters of the condemned Alexandrian dogma, the monophysites of the east, did not abandon the struggle.

And again it was the emperors who, led by political considerations, undertook to dictate their own views to the Church and to impress them by force. Leo I., the Thracian, banished the heads of the monophysites; on the other hand, Basiliscus extolled monophysitism as the exclusive state religion and condemned the letter of Leo. Zeno again forbade men to touch upon these points of doctrine which had been so hotly disputed in the last century, and thus

annulled once more the resolutions of the last General Council of Chalcedon. The bishop of Rome broke off all ecclesiastical relations with the east. For thirty-five years (484-519) the imperial Church was divided. Justinian I. (527-565) at last succeeded at the fifth œcumenical council at Constantinople in reconfirming these resolutions of Chalcedon.

The result was that the extreme monophysites severed themselves from the Church and formed independent communities, especially in Egypt, Syria, Persia, Armenia, and Abyssinia. The rejection of



ONE OF ROME'S OLDEST CHURCHES

The church of St. Mary in Aracoeli is one of Rome's most ancient Christian buildings, dating from the sixth century. Photo: Alinari.

the resolutions of Chalcedon and the recognition of the "bandit synod" at Ephesus are common to all.

In Syria, and also in Egypt, the monophysites termed themselves "Jacobites" after the man who, in the first period after the separation from the imperial Church, was the spiritual head of this entire party.

A Bishop Appoints 100,000 Priests & Deacons Jacob Barradai for thirty years — after becoming monophysitic bishop of Edessa in 541 — wandered through the whole of Nearer Asia disguised as a beggar, and, sparing no exertions, everywhere collected and encouraged his scattered fellow-believers, organised communities, appointed many bishops, and "fully one hundred thousand priests and deacons." In Asia Minor, it is true, the imperial Church prevailed, but in the patriarchate of Antioch for a time almost the entire population became Jacobite. The hope of reconciling the monophysites with the Church would not let the question once raised drop, even within the imperial Church. How, if a compromise were offered the discontented party by the admission that the Redeemer had only *one* will, even if He had two natures? Thus the monophysite dispute passed into the monothelitic. The same aspect of events was presented as before, the eastern Church hanging in the most complete dependence on the state, and the life of the state wasting away in ecclesiastical controversies.

There was the same result as before. At the sixth œcumenical council at Constantinople, in 680, the encyclical letter of Pope Agatho was made the basis of the decision, and the resolution was sent to him for confirmation. There were two wills in Christ. The former pope, Honorius, was solemnly and vigorously condemned as an execrable heretic, who had assented to an irregular imperial formula. Agatho confirmed this condemnation of his predecessor, "who

Pope Brands his Predecessor as a Heretic by mean treachery had tried to overthrow the unsullied faith." This, at a time when the infallibility of the pope was not yet declared, must have assured to the "apostolic throne" the reputation of a disinterested vindicator of orthodoxy.

Controversies over dogma were followed by disputes as to pictures and images. By the beginning of the eighth century the worship of images had reached such a

pitch in the east that the more thoughtful became anxious. Images were invited to act as god-parents, and men even scraped the colour off them in order to use it for purposes of consecration. The energetic emperor, Leo III., the Isaurian (717-741), ventured on the command to hang the pictures so high as to make it impossible for worshippers to kiss them.

His son and successor, Constantine V., undertook the systematic persecution of the friends of image worship. They were imprisoned, scourged, and their noses and ears were cut off. The popes protested. More than once they hurled the terrible bolts of excommunication at all foes of image worship. But for many decades, according to the imperial orders, the images were repeatedly torn down and raised again. In the end the Roman view gained a decisive victory: the empress, Theodora, in 842 caused the resolutions of the seventh council to be reinforced and celebrated the festival of orthodoxy.

If, now, it was possible to deprive Rome of its glory as champion of immaculate orthodoxy, then its claim to the first rank in the Church could be repudiated. Search was made for some ground of complaint, and a pretext was found in the failure of Rome to respect the ancient faith and customs. Rome ordered fasting on Saturday. It permitted the use of milk, butter, and cheese during the first week of Lent. It did not tolerate the marriage of priests.

Victory of Rome When Pope Nicholas I., therefore, declared himself for the deposed patriarch of Constantinople and against his successor, Photius, the latter impeached the Roman Church of heresy on account of these innovations, and obtained from a council in 867 the deposition and banishment of the pope. Nicholas pronounced excommunication against him and his followers. In 1053, the patriarch of Constantinople, Michael Cærularius, renewed the charges against Rome, adding the new heresy that Rome, in the Holy Eucharist, used unleavened bread, after the manner of the Jews. When negotiations for peace proved vain, the papal legates laid a letter of excommunication on the altar of the church of St. Sophia, and Michael, with the other patriarchs of the east, put the Roman Church under the ban in 1054. The Churches of the east and west were permanently severed.

WILHELM WALTHER



EUROPE
SECOND DIVISION
EASTERN EUROPE
From the Sundering of Rome to the
FRENCH REVOLUTION

With the partition of the "World Empire" of Rome into East and West, the History of Europe also divides into two main streams; not indeed without their points of contact, but following distinct courses until the shock of the French Revolution brings all the nations of Europe into closer political relations.

In our next division, therefore, we trace the course of events in Eastern Europe during this period. The West is Latin, Keltic, Teutonic; the East is Greek, Mongolian, Slavonic. At first its history is that of the Roman Empire as it survived in the East—the Greek or Byzantine Empire. But new peoples appear on the scene from the regions beyond the Danube, whither the Roman power had not penetrated.

These are in part of Mongolian or Tartar origin: Huns, Avars, Bulgarians, then Magyars or Hungarians; in part Aryan Slavs; southwards, the Serbs and Croats; the Western Slavs or Czechs of Bohemia; the Eastern Slavs of Poland and Russia. Finally come the Mongolian Turks, creating the Ottoman Empire, the single aggressive Mohammedan element among the Christian peoples of the West.

Thus the nations whose story we here record are those of the Balkan peninsula; of Hungary and Bohemia, which form the bulk of the composite Austrian Empire of to-day; of Poland, and of Russia.

GENERAL SURVEY OF THE PERIOD

By R. Nisbet Bain, M.A.

BYZANTIUM

By Professor Rudolf von Sclav

THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

By Professor Heinrich Zimmerer

**HUNS, BULGARIANS, ROUMANIANS, MAGYARS,
GIPSIES**

By Dr. Heinrich von Wilslocki and Dr. H. F. Helmolt

ALBANIANS

By Professor Karl Pauli and Dr. H. F. Helmolt

WESTERN SLAVS

By Dr. Berthold Bertholz

POLAND AND RUSSIA

By Professor Vladimir Milkowicz





MAP TO ILLUSTRATE THE SECOND DIVISION OF EUROPE

The above map is at once historical and geographical, showing as it does the principal peoples of Eastern Europe in the countries of their origin or occupation, and the different empires, kingdoms, and states that arose out of the wreckage of the Roman empire, together with the territories of Byzantium throughout the chequered career of that great power. Most of the ancient and famous towns that figured in the continually changing history of Eastern Europe, from the fall of Rome to the eve of the Napoleonic era, are also indicated.

EASTERN EUROPE TO THE



FRENCH REVOLUTION GENERAL SURVEY OF THE PERIOD

By R. Nisbet Bain, M.A.

THE origin of the states of South-eastern Europe must be sought in the history of the East Roman Empire. We have long outlived the curious prejudice which affected to regard "the Lower Empire," or "the Byzantine Empire"—both names, by the way, are absolutely without historical sanction—as fit only to be relegated to the limbo of things best forgotten. It is doubtful, even now, if we realise adequately the excellence of the immense and imposing edifice which Justinian founded, and Leo the Isaurian completed. Yet, if stability and vitality, if power of cohesion and recuperative virtue, be the true tests of political efficiency, then the East Roman Empire must be pronounced one of the most marvellous political organisms which ever existed.

The same ethnographical revolution which bridged over the gap between ancient and mediæval history in the west operated in the east likewise, but with this great difference: while the old order of things in the west vanished at the first touch of the new barbarian hordes, in Eastern Europe the empire gradually transformed and assimilated

**Eastern Diplomacy
and Western
Brute Force**

the new elements without suffering irreparable damage to itself for many centuries. The unique situation of the imperial city; the more pliable and adaptable genius of the Greeks (for from Justinian onwards the Hellenic element predominates); the intellectual superiority of the Constantinopolitan government, which invented and triumphantly applied the science of diplomacy when brute force was, everywhere else, the *ultima ratio*—

these were the most salient advantages which enabled the rulers of New Rome not only to weather the earlier and more terrible tempests of the transmigration period, but also to provide against similar perils in the future.

The first barbarians with whom the reconstituted empire had to do were the Slavs. As early as 449 one of the numerous branches of this great family, possibly the Serbs, established themselves along the northern banks of the Danube, extending as far westwards as Dalmatia. An ancient and respectable tradition claims both Justinian ("Upravda") and Belisarius ("Vebchar") as members of this race. Somewhat later, about the end of the sixth century, the Bulgarians, a Finno-Ugrian race, migrated from the steppes between the Don and the Dnieper, settled in Mœsia, and, by the ninth century, were completely Slavicised in their new surroundings. Both races became the nominal subjects of the empire, which aimed at making them serve the double purpose of buffer-provinces towards the north, and recruiting grounds for the imperial generals, while preserving a local autonomy. But the Bulgarians, who remained heathens for two centuries after their inclusion within the confines of the empire, were too martial a race to submit to any yoke for long. The empire was continually at war with them; more than once they besieged Constantinople itself, and their onslaughts were the more perilous as they coincided with the interminable attacks of the Arabs from the south. During a considerable portion of this period the Bulgarian hosts must

have included the Servians also as subject auxiliaries. Bulgaria and Servia were converted to Christianity about the same time (about 864-867) by the famous orthodox missionaries Cyril and Methodius and their followers.

The process was accelerated by political considerations, and had important political

A Great Bulgarian Nation

consequences. Two new kingdoms, for whose alliance east and west competed, arose within the Balkan peninsula.

The first independent Servian kingdom—founded by Peter in 872—was of comparatively brief duration; but the Bulgarian kingdom of Boris and Simeon lasted for two hundred years and overshadowed the eastern empire itself. At the period of its greatest expansion the Bulgarian realm stretched from the Danube and Drave to the Rhodope and Pindus ranges, embracing the whole valley of the Danube, nearly the whole of Thrace, and large parts of Thessaly, Macedonia, and Epirus.

In 866 the eastern empire first came into contact with another Slavonic race—the Russians, who, a few years previously, had established themselves under their Norse leaders at Kiev on Dnieper, immediately abutting on the vast south-eastern steppes. It was an ideal resting-place and starting-point for predatory barbarians with a taste for adventure. In 907 Oleg, prince of Kiev, imposed a heavy tribute upon Constantinople; but his successor, Igor, in 945 made a perpetual peace with the Greeks and Christianity began to permeate "the land of the Russ."

In 955 the Russian princess Olga was christened at Constantinople, though it was not till 990 that Vladimir the Great, who two years previously had been baptised at Cherson in the Crimea, on which occasion he married the Greek princess Anna, forcibly converted the Kievlyans to the new faith with the assistance of orthodox missionaries. Hence-

Why Russia Adheres to the Greek Church

forth the relations between the two states were almost uniformly friendly; Svyatislav, prince of Kiev (945-972), even aided the Greeks against the Bulgarians; but during the latter part of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century the intercourse between Constantinople and Kiev was interrupted by the interminable Bulgarian wars which engrossed the attention of the emperors of the Macedonian dynasty. During the

interval the young Russian Church, under Yaroslav the Great (1019-1054), became virtually autocephalous.

Hitherto the most potent weapon of the imperial city on the Bosphorus, a weapon far more effectual than diplomacy, regular armies, or Greek fire, because it had a moral aim and a supernatural sanction, was the orthodox religion. But at the beginning of the eighth century the very foundations of the orthodox religion were undermined by the rationalistic movement known as iconoclasm. There can be no doubt that a closer acquaintance with Mohammedanism as a religion promoted scepticism as to the central verities of Christianity among the more speculative Byzantines, especially in the eastern provinces of the empire.

To such theorists a deism like the religion of Islam would seem clearer, purer, and more natural than the highly-developed dogmatic system of Christianity, with its intricate, interpretative ritual. The emperors of the Isaurian and Armenian dynasties, who reigned from 717 to 867, themselves more Oriental than Hellenic, and certainly statesmen rather than

War Against Images

theologians, imagined that the readiest way to defend orthodoxy against the onslaught of a deistic philosophy was to abolish or at least to curtail as much as possible everything symbolical in religion as being parasitical, or at best superfluous, and therefore more liable to attack from outsiders. Hence their open, persistent war against the icons, or images. It was the same principle, in a less extreme form, as that which moves the more destructive section of the higher critics of our own day to eliminate the miraculous element from Scripture. But strong men though the iconoclastic emperors were, they were not strong enough to reform orthodoxy. The sole result of all their efforts in this direction was the division of the empire for a century and a half into two fiercely antagonistic camps, whose hostility seriously weakened both the Church and the commonwealth. Historically, the ultimate victory of the opposing, or iconoclast, party meant the triumph of the Hellenic and Slavonic over the Oriental elements in the empire.

The two following centuries (867-1018) were a period of recovery and re-expansion under the princes of the great Macedonian dynasty. Its salient features are 'the

EASTERN EUROPE TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

systematic conversion of the southern Slavs, and their subsequent life and death struggle with the empire for the hegemony of South-eastern Europe. All the previous wars had been, more or less, plundering raids; these later wars were for political ascendancy. Finally, at a terrible cost, the empire prevailed, and Basil II. (976-1025) once more extended its limits to the Danube.

Within the same period occurred an event of capital importance to the Slavonic race generally, which, roughly speaking, at that time occupied the whole of Central Europe from the Baltic to the Danube. That event was the intrusion of the Magyars, or Hungarians. The Magyars, presumably an Ugro-Finnic race, though the real origin of this interesting people is still a riddle, are first heard of on the right bank of the Don, the Lebedia or Livadia of Greek chronicles. Expelled thence by the more numerous Pechenegs, they took refuge in "Etelcum," as the contemporary Greeks called the districts roughly corresponding to Podolia and Moldavia, and were immediately, 893 or 894, enlisted in the service of the emperor

**Changing
the Face
of Europe**

Leo VI., against the Bulgarians. In 895 their chieftain, Arpad, led them through the Vereczke pass into what is now the "Alföld," or great Hungarian plain, but which then formed the eastern portion of the vast, shadowy empire of Moravia, extending from Prague to the Drave and the Vistula. By 905 the Magyars had occupied the whole of this plain, separating permanently the northern and western Slavs from their southern and eastern brethren, and thus changing the face of Central Europe.

For nearly a century after the "honfoglalás," or "occupation," as Hungarian historians call it, the Magyars continued to be pagan and predatory, ravaging east and west impartially. Tamed at last by the disasters of Augsburg in 955 and Adrianople in 970, they set about putting their house in order. For some time it was doubtful whether they would accept Christianity from Pope or Patriarch. Proximity favoured the eastern Church, and the first Hungarian prelate, Hierothus, consecrated "Bishop of Turkia," came from Constantinople.

But as the Byzantine empire grew stronger and stronger under the Macedonian dynasty, fear of a neighbour so

formidable and so near moved the Hungarian duke, Geza, to solicit missionaries from Pilgrim, bishop of Passau. The question to which branch of the Church the Magyars were to belong was settled, once for all, when Saint Stephen accepted the kingly crown from the hands of the Pope, Sylvester II., in 1001. Christianity

**Christianity
Established
in Hungary**

was not, however, definitely established in Hungary till the beginning of the twelfth century, and even then a large pagan population, constantly reinforced from the outer barbarians—notably the Cumanians, or Huns, who were planted in large colonies beyond the Theiss—had to be tolerated.

Fortunately, the immediate successors of St. Stephen were men of valour and genius, quite equal to the double task, difficult as it was, of preserving domestic order and, at the same time, of asserting the independence of the young central kingdom alike against the eastern and the western empires, both of which repeatedly endeavoured to reduce it to the condition of a vassal state. One of these early princes, St. Ladislaus (1077-1095) conquered and Christianised Croatia. His successor, Coloman, went still further, and extended the boundaries of Hungary to the sea, successfully contesting the possession of Dalmatia and its islands with the rising young Venetian republic. This was the beginning of the struggle, centuries long, between Hungary and Venice for the command of the Adriatic, which ultimately resulted in the triumph of the latter.

The most dangerous period for Hungary was when the Comnenian dynasty restored for the last time the supremacy of the eastern empire. During the glorious reign of Manuel (1143-1180), himself a semi-Magyar—he was the grandson of St. Ladislaus—this danger became acute. Manuel treated the Hungarian throne as if it were a family possession; but he was

**Hungary a
Conquering
Power**

too much occupied elsewhere to attempt to conquer the country, and on the collapse of his dynasty, shortly after his death, Hungary once more became a conquering power. This (1173-1196) is the period of the acquisition of those "banates," or protective marches, Rama, or North Bosnia, Macso, or North Servia, and Szöreny, or West Wallachia, which so long protected Hungary from the incursions of her southern neighbours.

The thirteenth century, however, was a period of dire calamity and complete disintegration. The degeneracy of the Arpad dynasty, the consequent domination of a lawless and conscienceless oligarchy, the Tartar cataclysm (1240-1243), the hap-hazard re-peopling of the ruined kingdom with semi-pagan elements, like the Cuman-

Predominance of the Slavs ians, resulting in a general lapse into savagery affecting the dynasty itself—all these visitations and their cumulative effect demonstrated that Hungary must be regenerated from without if she were to remain a member of the Christian commonwealth. The Holy See, therefore, wisely intervened; the last Arpad was hunted down, and the iron discipline of feudalism, administered by the great princes of the Neapolitan branch of the house of Anjou (1308-1382), raised the fallen kingdom once more from her ashes to an unprecedented degree of power and splendour.

Meanwhile, the Balkan peninsula had become predominantly Slavonic. The Greek empire disappeared from Europe. Its supplanter, the feudal empire of Romania, withering rapidly in uncongenial soil, had, within a few years of its foundation, virtually shrunk within the walls of Constantinople. It was an easy task for Michael Paleologus, in 1261, with the aid of the Genoese and the Venetians, to cleanse the orthodox capital from the Latin debris. But the new empire was but a shadow of the old one. Its restoration was mainly a successful commercial speculation on the part of the Italian maritime cities. The Greeks were from the outset too heavily burdened by their obligations to their allies to profit by their delusive good fortune. They could pay their debts only by reducing their armaments, and collapse was the inevitable if long-postponed result. Anyhow, from the beginning of the thirteenth to the middle of the fourteenth century Serbs and Bulgars

Serb and Bulgar at Variance triumphed over Greeks and Latins alike, and divided the inheritance of Constantine between them. Unfortunately for themselves, and for Europe, the great Nemanyidæ and Asyenidæ dynasties, which represented Serbia and Bulgaria respectively, were constantly at war with their neighbours and with each other, and the intermixture of religious with political questions—such, for example, as the rivalry of the two young autocephalous Churches

and the proselytising efforts of the Popes, to whom more than one "rex Slavorum" owed his kingly crown—prevented anything like stability. Another more insidious but none the less powerful solvent was the Bogomil heresy. This unnatural and antisocial revival of manichæism, which established itself in Bulgaria between 927 and 968, and by the end of the fourteenth century had permeated all the Slavonic races of the Balkan peninsula, though most virulent and indomitable in Bosnia, struck at the roots of domestic, social, and political life, and was one of the most powerful contributory sources of the comparatively easy triumphs of the Turks over the outwardly imposing but inwardly rotten Slavonic kingdoms.

The Turks, on the other hand, when they first appeared above the European horizon—conquest of Gallipoli, 1356—were uniquely equipped for a career of conquest. Already they alone of all nations possessed in the "Jenicheri," a regular standing army recruited from the flower of the conquered populations and bound together by the indissoluble ties of a discipline which was a tenet of their religion. How could the self-

The Turk Equipped for Conquest willed, undisciplined hosts of South-eastern Europe stand before veterans whose first and last duty was absolute obedience to their leaders? Five years after the transference of their capital from Broussa to Adrianople, the forces of the united Slavonic kingdoms were annihilated on the field of Kossovo in 1389. The gallant attempt of the feudal chivalry of Hungary and Western Europe to stem their progress failed miserably on the field of Nicopolis in 1396. By the end of the century their empire stretched from the Danube to Thessaly.

The destruction of Sultan Bajazet I. by Tamerlane the Tartar, or more correctly Tatar, at Angora, in 1402, presented Christendom with the only real opportunity it has ever had for expelling the Turks from Europe at next to no cost. The opportunity was neglected; the young Osmanli empire was allowed a quarter of a century to recover from its wounds, and by that time the fate of the southern Slavonic lands was sealed. For the next 500 years they are simply Turkish sandjaks, or military districts, with no history of their own. Constantinople owed its brief respite to the energetic intervention of

the Hungarians, who were routed, indeed, at Varna in 1444 owing to the undisciplined impetuosity of the feudal chivalry, but, under Janos Hunyadi and his son Matthias, held the balance equal during the critical last half of the fifteenth century. The victories of these extraordinary men, which so astounded their contemporaries, were due principally to their consummate generalship. They were the first to demonstrate that a skilfully-handled, regular army of Europeans was a match for almost any number of janissaries (janissaries) and spahis however brave, unless the odds were absolutely overwhelming, as at Mohacs in 1526.

The Hunyadis were materially assisted by a new nationality, the Wallachs—from which they themselves were descended—who founded semi-independent principalities in Moldavia (1354-1359), and in Wallachia (1338-1369). It is evident from the earliest known coins of the Wallachs that their rulers were Slavs of the Ruthenian, or Little Russian, stock, and originally vassals of the Hungarian Crown. The official language of the Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia was

Descendants of Trajan's Colonists Ruthenian for centuries to come, though the people over which they ruled seem to have been the descendants of Trajan's Roman colonies and spoke a language in some respects even closer to Latin than either Italian or Spanish.

The independence of the Hospodars was necessarily short lived. Their principalities traversed the line of least resistance to the Turkish advance, and, at the best of times, they were dependent either upon Hungary or Poland, according to circumstances and political exigencies. Wallachia paid tribute to the Porte as early as 1396, Moldavia not till 1513. But their comparative distance from Stamboul enabled them to maintain some pretence of autonomy at the worst periods of their chequered history, and the Turks themselves regarded the Danubian principalities as something higher than the down-trodden provinces of Servia, Bulgaria, Bosnia, and Greece. In the figurative language of the Divan they were "the two wings" by means of which the Padishah could take further flights northwards.

When Hungary also was finally submerged beneath the Turkish deluge in 1543 a third vassal principality, Transylvania, was added to the two Danubian "wings."

Still more remote from the Turkish capital, Transylvania consequently enjoyed a still larger measure of autonomy than Wallachia and Moldavia, and was even strong enough at times to take up an entirely independent attitude and successfully play Turkey off against the emperor, who was for long, and not un-

National Spirit of the Magyars justly, regarded as a more dangerous enemy than the sultan himself. Under the Protestant princes of the houses of Bethlen and Rakoczy in particular (1613-1648), Transylvania occupied a commanding position, which enabled her to act as the champion and guarantor of the constitutional privileges and the religious liberties of the Hungarians generally. Her political mission was to keep alive the Magyar nationality during the terrible Turkish domination and the scarcely less mischievous anti-national Catholic reaction which aimed deliberately at the denationalisation of Hungary.

The Hungarians as a nation took but a minor part in the final deliverance of their country from the Turkish yoke. Indeed, during the sixteen years war which was terminated by the Peace of Karlövic, in 1699, their most brilliant national representative, Imre Tököly, figured conspicuously on the Turkish side. It is also worthy of remark that the full limits of the ancient kingdom of Stephen were never recovered. It is true that by the Peace of Passarovic, in 1719, most of the old border banates, comprising Wallachia west of the Aluta, and the northern parts of Bosnia and Servia, were temporarily wrested from the Porte, but the Turks regained them all by the Peace of Belgrade in 1739, even including the fortress of Belgrade itself, which had belonged from time immemorial to Hungary, but forms part of modern Servia.

We now turn from South-eastern to Central Europe, which, as early as the seventh century, seems to have been peopled by numerous branches of the Slavonic family, but of these only the two principal ones, the Czechs and the Poles, need here occupy us. In the middle of the seventh century we find the former located in the modern Bohemia and owning some loose allegiance to Charles the Great. From Germany also the Czechs received their Christianity about 814, the traces of the earlier mission of Cyril and

Methodius having vanished irretrievably; and till 973, when the bishopric of Prague was established, the vast Bohemo-Moravian realm, which then extended as far as the modern Galicia, was ecclesiastically part of the diocese of Ratisbon.

Bohemia was never able to found a permanent Slavonic state in Central Europe.

German Culture in Bohemia German influences were too potent and too close at hand, and, besides, as already mentioned, the intrusion of the Magyars cut her off from her natural allies, the southern and eastern Slavs. German proximity was not, indeed, an unmixed disadvantage. To it Bohemia owed her relatively superior culture—the first German university was actually founded at the Bohemian capital, Prague, in 1349—and, more than once, especially during the brief but brilliant domination of the Premyslidæ (1197–1278), rose, by means of it, to an unlooked for degree of grandeur. But she was rarely more than one of several competing states of almost equal strength, which were for ever confederating against any neighbour which might happen, temporarily, to be the stronger. Matters were also complicated by dynastic amalgamations.

Thus, the Hapsburg dukes were frequently kings of Bohemia as well as emperors of Germany, while Hungary and Bohemia were more than once united under the same sovereign, to the serious detriment of both. No wonder, then, if the politics of Central Europe, from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century, were in a continual state of flux, and neutral intermediate provinces like Moravia, Silesia, Lusatia, Styria, and Carinthia, all of them Slavonic lands originally, were perpetually changing hands, belonging by turns to Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland, till the German element, as represented by the Hapsburg dukes, grew strong enough to subordinate the scattered

Bohemia's Mountain Bastions Slavonic elements everywhere and altogether. Bohemia was saved from actual absorption partly by her strong natural frontiers, a bastion of mountains protecting her on three sides, and partly by the extraordinary vitality of her Slavonic population. This was notably the case during the Hussite Wars, when the Czechs became a terror to all the surrounding states. At a later day they supplied Central Europe with its

finest mercenaries—the so-called *zsebraks*.

We possess no certain historical data relating to Poland till the end of the sixth century. It would seem that the progenitors of the Poles, originally established on the Danube, were driven thence to the still wilder wildernesses of Central Europe, settling finally among the forests and morasses of the basin of the Upper Oder and Vistula, where they dwelt in loosely connected communities till the pressure of rapacious neighbours compelled them to combine for mutual defence under the semi-mythical Piast and his successors. The Piasts wrested Chrobacya, a province extending from the Carpathians to the Bug, from the shadowy Moravian empire already mentioned. Under Mieszko I. (962–992) Poland nominally accepted Christianity from the Greek Church, but was reconverted by the Roman Church at the instigation of Boleslaus I. (992–1025) in order to obtain the protection of the Holy See against the persistent pressure of the Germans from the west.

Boleslaus was also the first Polish king, and he founded an empire which extended from the Baltic to Volhynia and from the Elbe to the Bug. This empire persisted in its main outlines till the death of Boleslaus III. (1102–1138), whose last act was to subdivide his territories among his numerous sons, who re-subdivided them among their children. This "partitional period," as it is called, lasted till 1305, during which period Poland ceased to be a political entity. By the time that the kingdom was reconstituted by Wladislaus Lokietek (1306–1339), the Teutonic Order had excluded Poland from the Baltic, and a new state, Lithuania, had intervened between her and her ancient neighbour in the east—Russia.

The Lithuanians, an Aryan but not a Slavonic race, originally dwelt among the impenetrable forests and morasses of the Upper Niemen, where they were able to preserve their original savagery longer than any of their neighbours, and foster a tenacious and enterprising valour which made them very formidable to all the surrounding states. They first emerge into the light of history at the time of the settlement of the Teutonic Order in the north. Rumours of the war of extermination waged against their near kinsfolk, the wild Prussians, by the Knights, first awoke them to a sense of

EASTERN EUROPE TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

their own danger. They immediately abandoned their loose communal system for a monarchical form of government, and under a series of exceptionally capable princes, notably Mendog (1240-1263) and Gedymin (1315-1341), began an astonishing career of conquest, so that, at the death of Gedymin, the grand-duchy of Lithuania, as it was henceforth called, extended from Courland to the Carpathians and from the Bug to the Dniester, including the old Russian principalities of Polock, Kiev, and Chernigov.

Poland and Lithuania were naturally drawn together by their common fear and hatred of the Germans, sentiments even strong enough to bring about a personal union of the two autonomous states under the Lithuanian Grand Duke Jagiello, or Jagellon, who took the name of Wladislaus II. on the occasion of his baptism and coronation at Cracow in 1386.

The cardinal political event of East Central Europe during the next century was the duel *à outrance* between Poland-Lithuania and the Teutonic Order. Ultimately decided in favour of Poland, it was, nevertheless, but a half-victory, for

Poland the Leading Power while the Knights were compelled to relinquish their grip on the modern Courland, Samogitia, and West Prussia, they were permitted, as the vassals of Poland, to retain possession of the modern East Prussia, or Ducal Prussia, as it was now called, when, in 1525, the last Grand Master of the Order became the first Duke of Prussia, with his capital at Königsberg.

This partial triumph was due entirely to the foresight and tenacity of the princes of the house of Jagiello, who steadily recognised that unification, and the possession of a seaboard, were the essential conditions of the maintenance and stability of the Polish commonwealth. The last prince of that house, Sigismund II. (1548-1572), crowned the work of his predecessors by amalgamating Poland and Lithuania indissolubly by the Union of Lublin in 1569. Poland was now the leading power of Central Europe, and indisputably the head of the Slavonic world. Territorially, she was superior to every other contemporary state except the Turkish empire.

Meanwhile, the existence of another vast state in the depths of the Polish hinterland was barely suspected in Western Europe

much before the end of the fifteenth century. Muscovy may be said to have been discovered, about the same time as America, by a German traveller, Ritter Niklas von Poppel, who, in 1486, brought to Vienna the strange tidings that North-eastern Russia was not, as generally supposed, a part of Poland, but a

Beginnings of the Russian Empire vast independent state even larger than Poland. Yet the beginnings of the Russian empire had been far more

brilliant in promise than the beginnings of the Polish kingdom. While the progenitors of the Poles were struggling in their native swamps, the progenitors of the Russians were alternately the adversaries and the allies of the Greek emperors of the east. As early as the tenth century the court of Yaroslav, the son of Vladimir the Great, was renowned throughout Europe as much for learning as for splendour, and the kings of France, Hungary and Norway were suitors for the daughters of the grand duke of Kiev.

But after the destruction of Kiev by the Tartars evil days fell upon "the land of the Rus." The current of the national life was now forced to flow north-eastwards instead of following its natural south-western course as heretofore. It was in the rude climate and among the vast virgin forests of the plain of the Upper Volga that the Russian princes, cut off from western civilisation, began, painfully and laboriously, to build up again the Russian state. For generations to come they were the tributaries and the vassals of the Tartar khans. Nor did their own hands deliver them. It was the victories of the Lithuanian princes which compelled the Tartars somewhat to relax their grip of South-western and Central Russia, and the provinces so released fell, naturally, to the victors.

Thus it came about that by the time the northern princes had established a fresh centre of nationality and orthodoxy under the leadership of the patient and strenuous grand dukes of Moscow, at least one-half of the old Russian lands, with their orthodox Slavonic population, had become part of Lithuania, a foreign state, and, still worse, the ally and consort of Catholic Poland.

In fact, from the end of the fourteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century the term "Russia" is merely a geographical

expression with various significations. As used by the Poles, it invariably means the woiwody, or palatinate, of Red Russia, which extended, roughly speaking, from the watershed of the Upper Vistula to the watershed of the Pruth. As used by the Muscovites, it meant all those Russian lands outside the actual limits of the grand duchy of Moscow, which the grand duke claimed as the descendant of Vladimir; that is to say, Black Russia, Red Russia, Little Russia and White Russia, by far the larger portion of which had been incorporated either with Lithuania or with Poland. Hence the peculiar significance of the coveted title, "Sovereign of all the Russias." The highest encomium which the old Muscovite chronicles could bestow upon a prince in those miserable days of anarchy and dispersion was to describe him as a "*sobiratel*," or "gatherer," of the provinces which, taken together, formed the original heritage of the Russian people.

All the old Muscovite grand dukes and tsars from Ivan I. to Ivan IV. (1328-1584) were more or less successful "gatherers" of land. They were, generally speaking, a stealthy, crafty, cowardly race. Indeed, personally they seem contemptible by the side of the heroic and sagacious rulers of contemporary Poland. The means such men employed to gain their end were almost necessarily base and vile in the extreme; but the end invariably aimed at—the unification and civilisation of Russia—was indisputably a high one, and whatever their vices, patriotism, the highest virtue of a statesman, cannot be denied to the worst of them. Moreover, they were popular, for they stood between the people and the people's secular oppressors, the official classes. So far as their arm could reach, the people were protected, and rough justice was generally done. Thus, on the

Russia the Work of Autocrats whole, it is no hyperbole to declare that whatever of glory and prosperity she may possess, Russia owes it almost entirely to the initiative of her autocrats.

In the very nature of things, the history of Poland and Muscovy was bound sooner or later to resolve itself into a struggle for the possession of the alienated orthodox Russian provinces. At first, however, this struggle was desultory and intermittent. Other questions more imme-

diately urgent postponed the final settlement. Poland could not give proper attention to the Muscovite question, still of but secondary importance, so long as the Prussian incubus thwarted and crippled her nearer home; while till Muscovy had freed herself from the paralysing Tartar yoke, she could do little more than harrow and vex the Lithuanian borders. The inevitable antagonism between the two peoples was exacerbated by the determined attempts of Muscovy to gain an adequate seaboard on the Baltic, on the collapse of the Livonian Order, and the equally determined efforts of Poland to prevent her rival from becoming wealthier and more civilised by means of maritime commerce and free intercourse with the west.

By this time Muscovy had dealt a mortal blow at the Tartar domination. The overthrow of the khanate of Kazan by Ivan the Terrible, in 1552, was, perhaps, no very extraordinary exploit from a purely military point of view; nevertheless, politically, it was an epoch-making event in the history of Eastern Europe. At Kazan, Mohammedan Asia had fought behind its last trench against Christian Europe marshalled beneath the banner of the Tsar of Muscovy. Nothing could now restrain the natural advance of the young Russian state towards the east and south-east.

For the first time in history the Volga became a Russian river. The conquest of the Caucasus and of Central Asia was now only a matter of time. But the superior civilisation of Poland and Sweden still barred the progress of Muscovy westwards. She had, indeed, taken advantage of the embarrassments of the Polish Sigismunds (1506-1572) to extend her dominions westwards to the Middle Dnieper, and the capture of the great fortress of Smolensk in 1514 was the first serious advantage she had yet gained over her rival. But, half a century later, Poland also had improved her position. By the middle of the sixteenth century most of her external embarrassments had vanished; the Union of Lublin had almost doubled her material resources, while in Stephen Báthory and Jan Zamoisky she possessed the greatest warrior and the greatest statesman of the age. It was in vain that Ivan IV. pitted his innumerable semi-barbarous hordes against such

EASTERN EUROPE TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

opponents. Victory, with whatever odds, was impossible.

But the collapse of Muscovy and the triumph of Poland at the end of the sixteenth century were, after all, most delusive phenomena. Muscovy was saved from apparently inevitable dissolution by an outburst of religious enthusiasm, which demonstrated that the nation, after all, was sound at the core; and less than fifty years after the humiliating treaty of Deulino, in 1617, which had flung the Muscovites back among their steppes and forests, the scales were reversed, and Poland had already entered upon her long agony.

Poland presents the unique example of a people which deliberately destroyed itself, politically, rather than submit to the trammels of ordinary government. Absolute individual liberty as the exclusive privilege of a single class (the *Szlachta*, or nobility) was the one ideal of Polish politicians. The earliest manifestation of this arrogant self-will was the claim, constantly made by the aristocracy, to renounce their allegiance whenever they differed from the king as to the nature and extent of their obligations—a claim which ultimately received legal sanction by the statute "*De non præstanda obœdientia*" in 1607.

Simultaneously, a movement against the middle and lower classes began. The burgesses were deprived of their right to send deputies to the local diets. They were forbidden to hold extra-mural estates, with the view of disqualifying them for military service. Their goods were heavily taxed, so that they should not compete with the nobles, the produce of whose estates went toll free. They were excluded from high ecclesiastical preferment. The peasantry fared even worse. They were chained to the soil, forbidden to learn trades, and degraded into serfs, becoming, at last, as much the property of their masters as the oxen with which they tilled the fields. The Jagiellos, indeed, had fought with some success against these aristocratic centrifugal tendencies. Five out of seven of these princes were great statesmen who, on principle, defended the rights of the middle and lower classes against the usurpations of the gentry, lest the equilibrium of the state should be destroyed. They were able to exercise this balancing

power because they were hereditary monarchs, and possessed such vast estates in Lithuania as to make them, in ordinary circumstances, independent of the subsidies of the diet.

When, however, in 1572, Poland was converted into a purely elective monarchy, every safeguard against aristocratic domination was swept away. Henceforth the diet was composed exclusively of the gentry. The kings in time of peace were little more than honorary titled presidents, with far less of influence than the presidents of the United States exercise in our own day. In time of war, if they happened to be distinguished soldiers, they were allowed to lead the armies of the republic against its enemies, generally at their own expense. But it was conceivable that a victorious monarch at the head of a devoted army might chafe at his humiliating condition of tutelage, and thus become a dangerous rival to the diet. To prevent such a contingency, the *szlachta* deliberately used its power of the purse to cut down the national armaments and the national defences to starvation point—finally abolishing the regular forces altogether as superfluous. Yet of all the states of Europe, Poland stood most in need of a large, a very large, standing army.

With no natural boundaries, constantly exposed to attack from every quarter, surrounded by watchful and greedy neighbours, it should have been the first principle of the dominant *szlachta* to be always and everywhere on the alert, well mounted, armed *cap à pie*, and with whole arsenals of offensive weapons ready to hand. The geographical position of Poland, even more than the duty of her rulers to their own people, demanded such precautions. The Jagiellos had shown the way. They had fused into one homogeneous political whole a congeries of different nationalities, more or less akin ethnologically, but differing immensely in language and religion, and, above all, in degrees of civilisation. The lawlessness and parsimony of the diets had, it is true, prevented the perfect accomplishment of their patriotic dream of empire.

Had the diets loyally responded to the just demands of these great monarchs, Silesia and Lusatia might not have been lost, the Prussian provinces would

have been incorporated and Polonised, Smolensk would never have fallen, the dangerous steppes would have been fortified and colonised. Nevertheless, despite every obstacle and impediment, beneath the guidance of the Jagiellos Poland had gradually ascended to the dignity of a great power, and they left

A Country that Committed Suicide her the mistress of her own destiny. Circumstances, moreover, were most favourable. Transylvania separated

her from Austria as well as from the Turks. The collapse of the Livonian Order opened up a prospect of fresh and easy conquests. The German emperors, absorbed by their own affairs, had ceased to be dangerous. The tsars had barely emerged from the enervating Tartar bondage.

Thus Poland was at the starting-point of an imperial career. Fortune's ball was at her foot, and she had but to kick it. She preferred, instead, to destroy her executive and her legislature as a first step towards political renunciation, as if she were safely isolated in the midst of an impassable ocean instead of being cast in the midst of a fermentation of ceaselessly struggling nationalities in which only the fittest fighter could hope to survive. Still worse, she deliberately threw away the providential gift of great men so liberally bestowed upon her during the latter part of the sixteenth and the earlier part of the seventeenth century. No other nation ever threw away its chances with such reckless bravado. She gave little help and no thanks to Stephen Báthory for driving back the Muscovite invasion of Ivan the Terrible. She even rejoiced that the wounds he had got in defending her were the cause of his death. She prevented Chodkiewicz from driving the Swedes out of the Baltic provinces, and Sigismund III. from partitioning Muscovy. She sent Zolkiewsky, her greatest captain, to certain death on the Turkish frontier rather than

The Cause of Poland's Doom reinforce him adequately, and broke the heart of her most popular king, Wladislaus IV., by crossing his patriotic endeavour

to found a navy. She frustrated John Casimir's plan of dealing adequately with the Cossack peril, thus throwing away her last chance of political salvation. And all for what? Simply for this—that half a million county magnates and country squires might each, in his own province or parish, do precisely what he liked.

While the high-born, showy Pole, the Slavonic Esau, was thus rejecting his political birthright, the hegemony of the Slavonic races, for the pottage of personal comfort the Slavonic Jacob, as we may call the Russian, stealthily, craftily, patiently and laboriously, with an unquestioning belief in the divine mission and ultimate triumph of orthodoxy, was already entering upon the inheritance which his more gifted brother on the Vistula had contemptuously thrown away. As early as 1667 the secular struggle between Poland and Muscovy was concluded by the "Truce" of Andrusovo, a truce which proved to be one of the most permanent peaces of history, for it endured for more than a hundred years. Muscovy recovered thereby the whole eastern bank of the Dnieper, including Kiev, the metropolis of ancient Russia and the source of her culture and religion, Chernigov and all the land between the Dnieper and the affluents of the Don. The thirteen-years war, terminated at Andrusovo, was the last open contest between the two powers. Henceforth, the influence of Russia over

Growth of Russia's Influence Poland was to increase steadily without any struggle at all, the republic being already stricken by that creeping paralysis which ultimately left her a prey to her neighbours.

Muscovy had done with Poland as an adversary, and had no longer any cause to fear her ancient enemy. She was now free to devote herself to other and more important matters upon which depended her historical continuity and existence, such as the subjection of the Cossacks, the colonisation and the extension of the vast Southern Ukraine, internal reforms in Church and State, and the recovery of the Baltic seaboard.

Throughout the reigns of the earlier Romanovs the great work of reform and reconstruction went steadily on. It is often too much taken for granted that Peter the Great created modern Russia. The foundations of modern Russia were laid while he was still in his nursery. Increased respect abroad was the corollary of increased efficiency at home. The mere fact that Russia, at the end of the seventeenth century, was invited to participate in the grand league against the Turk was eloquent as to her political progress, and although the campaigns of Prince Vasily Golitsuin in 1687-8, ended

EASTERN EUROPE TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

in disaster, yet the very appearance of a Russian army at the gates of the Crimea was a significant sign that the "steppe" was no longer a barrier to Russia's progress southwards. The subsequent capture of Azov, in 1696, by the youthful Peter marks a still further advance. It was the first time that Russia had ventured openly to cope with the forces of the Ottoman empire.

It is true that this initial success was discounted by the subsequent reverse on the Pruth in 1711; nevertheless, by the end of his reign Peter could safely challenge the Porte to a third contest, which he well knew it would never dare to accept. A few years before his death Russia was already one of the great powers of Europe, equally formidable on the Baltic and the Caspian. She had obtained, at last, a seaboard, and learnt to know her own value. Throughout the reigns of Peter's immediate successors (1725-1762) the prestige of Russia steadily increased. During this period her foreign policy was directed by two statesmen of the first rank, both of them Peter's "fledglings," Andrei Osterman and Alexis Bestuzhev.

Elizabeth and Catharine of Russia Peter's own daughter, the Empress Elizabeth, was also, in some respects, an even more remarkable personage than the brilliant and meretricious Catharine II. Anyhow, Elizabeth was a greater statesman than Catharine, because she always knew her own mind, and never allowed herself to be diverted from the main issue. At the end of her reign Russia was certainly the preponderating state in Europe. It should also not be forgotten that most of the great captains and statesmen who made the name of Catharine so illustrious were educated in the school of Elizabeth.

While Russia had thus become a great empire with a dominant voice in the European concert, Poland had, politically, almost ceased to exist. Under the Saxon kings (1697-1763) there was no government at all to speak of. The king, who resided in Dresden, rarely visited the kingdom. The biennial diet continued its sessions regularly enough; but it was as regularly "exploded" by the unscrupulous use of the "*liberum veto*," so that no work was done and not a single measure was passed for two generations. The long-sought political utopia of the Polish squirearch had, in fact, at last been realised. There was no army because he would not

pay for it. There was no diplomatic service because he did not see the use of maintaining so expensive an establishment. There was no administration of justice, because nobody dared to enforce the laws against offenders. The castles and fortresses were in ruins, the arsenals were empty, the frontier was defenceless, because the Grand-Hetmans, or Captains-General, who were supposed to provide all these things out of the revenues of their starosties, set apart for that special purpose, simply pocketed the money.

Poland, in fact, had ceased to be a state, and was nothing more than a loose collection of independent clans. The only focuses of whatever social and political life had managed to survive were to be found in the "courts" of two or three hundred magnates scattered all over the country. Many of these magnates were fabulously wealthy. The estates of the Potocki extended over thousands of square miles. The Radzivils were equally opulent. One member alone of that princely house was worth thirty millions sterling. It would have been a small thing to many of these great nobles to have contributed towards the national defence by training to the use of arms a few thousands of the heydukes, cossacks and "gentlemen servitors," who ate the bread of idleness in their palaces and country mansions, and never was Poland so much in need of a military police as during the last days of her existence.

That period was for Central Europe a period of almost incessant warfare. Poland generally lay in the direct path of the belligerents; and, despite her anxious and constant neutrality, her territories were systematically traversed, exploited, and ravaged as if the republic was a no man's land with which everybody might make free. But what could be expected from private enterprise when the Grand-Hetman Potocki, the dignitary responsible for the defence of the country, refused to place a small corps of observation on the Silesian frontier during the Seven Years War, "for fear of provoking hostilities," and when even such a friend of reform as Wacław Rzewuski, who resigned a high position in order the better to serve his country, could flippantly exclaim: "The republic died long ago, only it has forgotten to tumble down."

Since the days of Sobieski, in fact, Poland had become utterly incompetent to save herself from destruction. The demoralisation of her governing classes was incurable, their ignorance of affairs and events invincible. There was much of private virtue and personal excellence in the land, but of public spirit or political instinct scarce a trace. The Poles slumbered on with folded arms in the naive belief that Europe was so vitally interested in the maintenance of their anarchic independence and their useless territorial integrity that they need not stir a finger to help themselves. Warsaw was the last place in the world where the possibility of a partition was even imagined. There was now only one way of arresting the otherwise inevitable catastrophe, and that was for Poland to fling herself unreservedly into the arms of Russia, because, strange as it may sound, Russia was the enemy from whom she had least to fear.

Even now it is by no means so generally recognised as it might be that so late as 1770 the idea of a regular partition of Poland formed no part of the political calculations of the court of St. Petersburg. Count Nikita Panin, the political mentor of Catherine II., who controlled the foreign policy of Russia during the first sixteen years of her reign, had other views for Poland. He could not endure the thought of destroying the republic because he regarded it as an indispensable member of his projected "Northern Accord," which was to counterpoise in the north the influence of the Bourbon-Hapsburg League. In this "accord" Poland was to take the place of Austria, especially in the case of Oriental complications.

Panin conscientiously opposed the first partition to the very last. In reply to an impatient reminder from Potsdam, in February, 1771, he informed the Prussian

Russia as the Protector of Poland Ambassador that the empress had so often and so solemnly guaranteed the territorial integrity of the republic that the open violation of that principle must produce everywhere the most unpleasant effect. He added that Frederick's suggestion that Russia should compensate herself in Poland for losses sustained elsewhere was regarded by the empress as "hard and offensive." The territory of Russia, he said, was already so vast that he

doubted whether any accretion would benefit her. This was perfectly true at the time. It was the absolute control of an autonomous but submissive Poland that Russia originally desiderated.

None of the contemporaries of the first partition seem to have regarded it unfavourably either from a political or a moral point of view. The general condemnation of it was of a much later date, and largely due to Europe's growing dislike of Catharine's policy in general and Panin's methods in particular. It should be added too that Russia comes best out of the miserable business. She prevented the partition as long as possible, and she won her share of it—which, by the way, consisted entirely of old Russian lands—at least by right of conquest, whereas Austria and Prussia got their portions of the spoil by no right at all.

Even after the first partition it was indisputably Poland's best policy to go hand in hand with Russia. It cannot fairly be urged that the diminution of the Polish state was in any way injurious to the Polish people. Panin's contention that the wrested provinces would benefit by the transfer was perfectly correct, and it should not be overlooked that the new constitution, adopted by the diet of 1775, which Russia invented to meet the new conditions of the republic, was, sentiment apart, far superior to anything of the kind which the Poles had been able to devise.

It is also a fact that, materially, Poland largely benefited by it. During the second Turkish war Poland had a unique opportunity of cementing the Russian alliance permanently, but the famous Quadrennial Diet, animated doubtless by the loftiest motives, flung away the last chance of an understanding, followed blindly the treacherous counsels of Prussia, and sacrificed Poland to an outburst of patriotic sentiment. The result we all know; Poland disappeared from the map of Europe. The methods of the Russian empress were, after all, less contemptible, less heinous, than those of the Prussian king. Catharine openly took the risks of a bandit who attacks an enemy against whom he has a personal grudge; Frederick William II. came up when the fight was over to help to pillage a victim whom he had encouraged to fight by swearing to defend him.

R. NISBET BAIN



THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

RISE OF THE EASTERN POWER

THE FLOURISHING OF BYZANTIUM

AND DREAMS OF A NEW WORLD-EMPIRE

WHEN the sixth century opened, the emperor at Byzantium was the Illyrian Anastasius. At his death, in 518, the captain of the guard was Justinus, a man of peasant birth from Tauresium, near Bederiana in Dardania—near the modern Uskub on the borders of Albania. His great reputation among the troops and the clergy impressed upon the eunuch Amantius, who administered the imperial treasury, the expediency of proposing him as emperor, in spite of his being very illiterate and hardly able to read or write. The newly-elected emperor, now an old man, had sometime previously invited his nephew, Flavius Petrus Sabatius Justinianus to the capital, and had given him a brilliant education.

The latter became the support, the counsellor, and the co-regent of his uncle. Accomplished in every subject which could win him the love of the clergy, and indeed of the Pope himself, the enthusiasm of the people, and the reverence of the senate, he was orthodox, lavish in providing games for the populace, and courteous towards the highest classes, although he ventured to marry an ex-ballet dancer,

A Dancing Girl Becomes Empress

Theodora, daughter of a bear-leader. His influence can be traced back to the year 518; from 520 onwards he is actually designated monarch—for example, by Leontius of Byzantium. Vitalian, his most dangerous rival, had been put out of the way at a banquet on the advice of Justinian. So, too, the completely coherent policy in Church and State, which aimed at gaining the West, and therefore had concluded peace with Pope Hormisdas

in 519 and reconfirmed the resolutions of Chalcedon, bears so clearly the stamp of Justinian's individuality that we must certainly term it his doing. Again, the provisions of a bilingual edict—issued in 527 by the two emperors, and found in 1889 on the borders of Pisidia and the Cibyratis—which protects the property

Emperor's Lack of Culture

of the churches against those enemies of all landowners, the passing or permanently quartered troops, show the same zeal for order as the "novels" which Justinian subsequently issued in his capacity of sole monarch. Only in less important departments, such as in the barbarous types of the coinage, which later were retained by Justinian himself until 538, is Justin's complete want of culture observable.

On August 1st, 527, Justinian took over the sole government of the empire, which remained under his guidance until November 14th, 565. The emperor, whose mother tongue was Latin, and whose family bore a Thracian name, Sabatius, has been claimed as a Slav; it is said that his original name was Upravda, which was translated into Latin as "Justinian"; but there is no adequate foundation for the legend. We may with much more probability recognise in him a Thracian, who, born on the frontiers of the decaying Thracian and the expanding Illyrian nationalities, bears a Thracian name and shows the vigour peculiar to the Illyrian, that is, Albanian nationality.

Gentle and forbearing, but proud of these as of other qualities, full of self-restraint towards his enemies, simple

almost to asceticism in his life, singularly conscientious in his work, for which he rose in the middle of the night, so that he was called the "sleepless monarch," endowed with the highest sense of his imperial dignity, which seemed to give him the power of producing legal commentaries, theological disquisitions, and schemes for military operations, a jealous

The First Great Emperor of Byzantium

despot, often vacillating and irresolute, but always supported by the activity of his intellect, Justinian towered above all his immediate predecessors by his peculiar talents. In the graceful head with the small mouth and strong lips, the straight nose and the soft expression of the eyes, which are represented in the mosaics of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo and San Vitale at Ravenna, we should see a cleric or a simple official rather than a great emperor, who showed creative genius in the fields of jurisprudence and architecture, who worked great reforms in the administrative sphere, but also in military and theological matters achieved ephemeral successes greatly to the detriment of the empire and the army.

Justinian performed a permanent service by his settlement of the principles of jurisprudence, completing the work of Constantine. The latter effected the first great reconciliation between the old civilised world and Christianity; his New Rome with all its creations was the fruit of that union. But Christianity, so far as its governors the priesthood were concerned, remained obstinately hostile to the legal forms and ideas of the ancient state; the legal ideas of the Mosaic code appealed to the clergy more nearly than the Roman law, and the masses must have shared this feeling. In this way religion and the judicial system became antagonistic one to the other; the judge who gives sentence according to "pagan" law becomes alien to his people until he prefers to be alien to his law, which nobody values. Ignorance asserts its dominion everywhere. But the legal conceptions of individual peoples grow dim before the

knowledge of Roman law; if that knowledge is strengthened, these peoples are no longer any obstacle to the despotism of the Roman law. Justinian had the deepest regard for this "infallible power"; he therefore tried by consolidating it to destroy Oriental influences for good and all.

Tribonian, a Pamphylian from a remote corner of Asia Minor, was the man who helped him in this great task. An active thinker, the greatest scholar of his time, competent to write on the nature of fortune and the duties of sovereignty as well as on the harmonious system of the universe; as much in his element when president of the various committees for recording the law as when treading the marble pavements of the emperor's palace at Byzantium, complete unscrupulousness in pursuing his private aims—these are the characteristics of the man who was the soul and the most active instrument of legislation. The colossal task of collecting

all imperial ordinances (*constitutiones*) in one new single work (*Codex Justinianus*) was carried through, thanks to the efficiency of the imperial chancery, in less than fourteen months. Antiquated ordinances were

omitted, whether superseded by new laws or merely nullified by the practice of the courts. Chronological arrangement within the separate titles facilitated reference. After April 16th, 529, all legal procedure throughout the empire had to conform to the ordinances of this collection. With praiseworthy consistency special decisions (the *quinquaginta decisiones*), by which the old

law was expounded, were given on doubtful cases and disputed points. After these most difficult questions, and with them some useless matters, had been settled, Justinian appointed a committee to make a collection of the old jurists and a book of extracts from them. Tribonian, the president of the committee, supplies with pride some hardly credible figures, which should give us a clear idea of the mere physical labour: 2,000 books with



Anastasius



Justinus I.



Justinian I.

THREE OF THE EARLY BYZANTINE EMPERORS

Anastasius ruled in Byzantium at the beginning of the sixth century, and on his death the uneducated Justinus, captain of the guard, was elected. His nephew and successor, Justinian, was brilliantly educated, and was called the "sleepless monarch," reigning from 527 to 565.

RISE OF THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

3,000,000 lines were compressed into 50 books with 150,000 lines. Professors and practitioners extracted in three large divisions the decisions which were before them, and in doing so cited the names and titles of the works on which they drew. Contradictions could not be entirely avoided; professional commentaries were to be forbidden, since they encroached on the sovereign's rights. This collection of the Digest, or Pandects, was invested with the authority of law on December 30th, 533.

The next task was to ensure that future lawyers should be educated on the lines

of these new sources of jurisprudence; the institutes, which contained the principles and essential elements of preliminary legal study, had to be brought into harmony with the form which the sources of jurisprudence now assumed. This was accomplished by Theophilus, a teacher of law in the school at Constantinople, and Dorotheus from the law school of Berytus, of course under the supervision of Tribonian, and with special use of the best existing text-books, above all to the institutes of Gaius. Antiquated expressions which might deter students were expunged so that the "new Justinians," as the young lawyers were now called, might not be discouraged.

The necessity now presented itself of revising the Constitutions once more, for there were many ordinances left among them which, owing to the legal lore now collected and available, must have seemed superfluous or contradictory. A second edition, the only one

**Justinian's
Revisions of the
Constitutions**

now extant, was therefore prepared in continuation of the Digest. Finally, the legislative activity of Justinian himself did not cease with the conclusion of the great work; it continued until the death of Tribonian, in 545, and found scope in the "Novellæ," which, composed in Greek or Latin (some bilingually),

are preserved far more completely than the earlier ordinances incorporated in the Codex Justinianus, and are extant in private, though not in official, collections. The simplification of the professional work

**Christian
Principles of
Jurisprudence**

of lawyers, the introduction into jurisprudence of Christian principles instead of Mosaic law, the establishment of complete legal uniformity—with which purpose the old law school at Athens was closed on account of the attention there devoted to Greek law—and special attention to the interests of the small citizen,

were the leading aims of Justinian and his scholars. The predominance of the rich was broken down by the grant of special privileges to the soldier caste, by laws concerning the succession to landed property, by giving the wife the right to inherit, by usury laws (in dealing with countrymen only four per cent. was allowed), and by measures in favour of debtors (thus by the *beneficium inventarii* the liability of the heir was limited by making an inventory to the amount of property left). At the same time the Christian duty of protecting the poor was emphasised, the relaxation of the *patria potestas*, the legal authority of the father, aimed in the same direction, and the remains of the old family state were destroyed. Consideration for the weak-



JUSTINIAN AND HIS CODE

This emperor's great work was the compilation from the vast existing writings of the "Justinian Code," which, in its final and digested form he is here shown presenting to Tribonian, his great assistant in the task. From the Vatican.

nesses of inferiors, in imitation of the Divine mercy, was laid down as the guiding principle of the new jurisprudence, and thus as much opposition was shown to the old Roman law, with its doctrine of "reward and compulsion" as to the Mosaic code; a phrase employed in another connection, which speaks of the "contemptible and Jewish sort," is very significant of the attitude of the emperor.

The Nika riots helped Justinian to crush the still existing popular organisations, and to establish a perfect absolutism. Hitherto the parties of the Hippodrome had

been organised as Demes in civil and military division, received some sort of popular representation, and took some part in the election of the emperor, even of Justinian. Precisely as the Hippodrome in its collection of works of art—the bronze horses, and Heracles Trihesperus of Lysippus, the ass of Aktion, the

**Blues and Greens
Against
the Emperor**

Wolf and Hyena, Helena, and a number of other works of art stood there—had become the successor

of the Roman forum and the Greek Agora, so it resounded with echoes of the political importance of the forum. The civil divisions stood under Demarchs, the military under Democrats; the Democrat of the Blues was the *domesticus scholarum*, the Democrat of the Greens *domesticus excubitorum*.

This military organisation rendered it possible to employ the Demes occasionally to defend the walls. The rule of whichever was temporarily the stronger party—under Justinian that of the Blues—produced an intolerable state of affairs. The impartiality of Justinian, who punished alike misdemeanants of either colour, led, in 532, to the union of the two parties (their cry "Nika"—victory), to the burning and destruction of the imperial palace, of the library of Zeuxippus and the church of St. Sophia. On the following days renewed fires reduced many buildings to ashes and street-fighting raged everywhere. Hipatius, nephew of the emperor Anastasius, was proclaimed rival emperor, and only the firmness of Theodora prevented Justinian from taking to flight. Negotiations with the Blues and the massacre of the Greens by Belisarius in the circus, where from thirty thousand to fifty thousand victims are said to have fallen, ended this last struggle of Byzantine national freedom.

Justinian had magnificent schemes of foreign policy. He frankly declared at a later time (in his "Novels") that he

**Justinian's
Dreams of a
World-Empire**

cherished confident hopes of winning by the grace of God the sovereignty over those territories which the ancient

Romans had once subdued as far as the boundaries of both oceans, but had subsequently lost through their carelessness. Hilderic, king of the Vandal state in Africa, had submitted to the influence of Byzantium, had coined money with the head of Justin I., but had been deposed on May 19th, 530, on account of his unwarlike nature and his

Byzantine sympathies. The repeated intervention of Justinian on behalf of Hilderic was rudely rejected by the newly-elected Gelimer; nevertheless, in view of the Persian War, and the want of a naval force and adequate supplies, a punitive expedition seemed impossible. But hatred of Arianism finally forced on the war. Belisarius was given the command of the fleet, which set sail at the end of June, 533. Although the voyage was necessarily prolonged, and laborious efforts were required to prevent the dispersion of the vessels, Belisarius entered Carthage on September 15th. By the middle of December, 533, the entire Vandal power was overthrown. At the end of March or beginning of April, Gelimer, the last Vandal king, surrendered.

The reintroduction of the Roman fiscal system and the stern suppression of Arianism made the Byzantine rule irksome; but it was consolidated by the timely repulse of the Mauri, or Berbers, and by the prosperity of Carthage, which now, with its palaces, churches, and baths of Theodora, became one of the most splendid cities of the empire. Byzantium now pos-

**Latin still
the Official
Language** possessed a Latin province, for Latin had remained the diplomatic language, and the official language for petitions to the

Romans, even among the Vandals. The province comprised Tripolitana, Byzacena, pro-consular Africa (Zeugitana), Numidia, Mauretania Sitifensis; while in Western Africa only a few places, such as Cæsarea (Cherchel) and the impregnable Septem, were Byzantine. Sardinia, Corsica, and the Balearic Islands were annexed. The result of the conquest was, however, not so lamentable as Procopius represents when he depicts in bitter words the depopulation, impoverishment, and misgovernment of Africa. The administration of Africa became important in determining the primitive form of the Byzantine military province, since it showed the necessity of a union between the civil and military authorities, which had been separated since the time of Constantine the Great. One hundred and fifty towns rose from their condition of desolation and ruin.

Justinian had become in Africa "the Avenger of the Church and the Liberator of the nations," and his general, Belisarius, the "glory of the Romans," as he is styled on the commemorative coins, could display in his triumphal procession the costly vases and robes, the gorgeous chariots, and


RISE OF THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

the golden ornaments which had found their way into the Vandal treasury from successful raids. Mosaics on the walls of the imperial palace glorified the conquest of Africa.

The conquest and annihilation of the East Gothic empire in Italy occupied fully eighteen years (536-554). Here two religious motives co-operated, at least at the outset of the struggle. The year 554 saw finally an expansion of East Roman power over the Spanish peninsula, where a small province was

panic into Byzantium in 558; his tents were pitched at Melanthias, or Buyuk Chekmadje, eighteen miles from Byzantium. The treasures from the churches in the neighbourhood had already been put into places of safety, and fear filled the trembling spectators on the walls. But Belisarius was victorious, and the defeated Koturgurs were attacked on their retreat by their hostile brethren the Urtigurs. The fortresses which had been planted over the wide Byzantine dominions

Belisarius
Again
Victorious



A TYPE OF THE GREAT BYZANTINE FORTRESSES

As the possessions of Byzantium extended vastly in the remoter parts of Europe, Nearer Asia and North Africa, immense fortresses such as this picture illustrates were erected in the conquered districts, with the idea of saving expenditure in troops; but this proved impracticable, as the garrisons required increased instead of diminished numbers of men. The castle illustrated is that of Haldra, erected in Tripoli, after Justinian's North African conquest.

formed, with Cordova as the capital. On the other hand the Persian wars (531-532, 539-562) brought little glory or success; the first ended with a treaty, which imposed annual payments on Byzantium.

Barbarians
Threaten
Byzantium The second treaty, of 562, contained the same condition, rendered less bitter by the cession of Laristan to Byzantium. Meanwhile waves of nations surged round the walls of Anastasius. Zabergan, the head of the Koturgurs—a Hunnish tribe which lived between the Don and the Dnieper—struck

proved unpractical; they required too many garrisons, instead of diminishing the necessity for troops. To commerce Justinian gave his fullest attention. The wars with Persia were certainly to some extent commercial wars, with the object of ousting Persia from the silk trade. Trading interests and religious motives led to an alliance with the Goths of the Crimea. The alliance with the Axumites must be criticised from this point of view. A treaty had been made with the emperor Justin which in 525 induced Elesbaas, or Caleb, of Axum to

make a campaign against the Jewish king of the Himyares. The immediate cause of the renewal of relations between Byzantium and Axum was that the reigning king of Axum had vowed to become a Christian if he conquered the Himyares, and that after his victory he applied to

Justinian Makes Friends With Rome

Justinian for a bishop. Finally the introduction of silk-worm breeding from Serinda, probably to be identified as Khotan, gave a great stimulus to the Byzantine silk industry. After that time silk-making, which, to the great detriment of the Syrian factories, was treated as a monopoly, turned to good account the traditional methods of Persia and China.

The ecclesiastical policy of Justinian was influenced by his ambitions and also by his great theological talents, which actually created new dogmas. He wished to gain the West, and therefore put himself on good terms with Rome, a policy which incensed Syria and Egypt. These conciliatory efforts of the emperor drove the Monophysites to leave the Church; and schism was further provoked by the theological leanings of Justinian, who wished himself to decide questions in the Church, although at that particular time her struggle to win independence was finding loud expression. Facundus, bishop of Hermiane, preached vehemently: "It is better to remain within the assigned limits; to transgress them may ruin many and will help none." A clear contrast was made between the reigning emperor and his predecessor, Marcianus: "Never has the pious and good emperor believed that he, a layman, can repeal with impunity that on which the holy fathers have decided in matters of faith." Gentle measures and force were alike unable to restore ecclesiastical unity. The clever and marvellously far-seeing Empress Theodora recognised more clearly than Justinian himself that the roots of Byzantine strength lay in the East; but, as

we have seen, the interference of Rome had prevented any abandonment of the resolutions of Chalcedon, and violent measures taken against the Monophysites in Alexandria could not be counterbalanced by the most subtly devised diplomatic revival of the old *Henotikon*, or Confession of Faith. This was Justinian's most serious mistake. Provinces which were, both in politics and in culture, the most important supports of Byzantium, were compelled to leave the Church; and the overtures which he made to them, though sufficient to incense the West, were insufficient to appease their dissatisfaction.

The military energy of Justinian attained no definite results, and the frittering away of his forces in ambitious efforts entailed heavy loss. But the importance of Justinian's reign lies in other fields. The true function of the Byzantine empire, as the focus of western and eastern intellectual powers, was largely his creation. The art of Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt blended on Byzantine soil into one uniform whole. Western law, reconciled with Christianity, spread over the world and prevented reactionary legislation. The political constitution of Roman times was extended



MOSAIC PORTRAIT OF JUSTINIAN



A reproduction on a larger scale of the portrait of Justinian from the St. Vitale mosaic on the opposite page. It is from this contemporary portrait of the emperor that we are able to study with some approach to accuracy his personal characteristics.

and improved until it embraced all spheres of human activity. The splendour of an Oriental court shed its brilliancy over the throne. The theological disputes of the world, in which the last remnant of liberty of thought had taken refuge, were decided by the secular sovereign

Byzantium the First Power in the World

himself; but here he encouraged the separation of West from East. With Justinian, Byzantium attains her position as the home of old traditions and the foremost civilised power, a position she maintained for centuries.

Procopius of Cæsarea (490-563) is not only invaluable as the historian of the Justinian age, but in his mixture of irreconcilable elements is an admirable



THE CELEBRATED BYZANTINE MOSAICS AT RAVENNA

The upper of these two illustrations, which are reproduced from the mosaics of St. Vitale, at Ravenna, is the group with the Emperor Justinian in the centre, supported by the great religious and military dignitaries of Byzantium; while the lower mosaic, from the same church, shows the Empress Theodora with priests and ladies of her court. These are of great historical and artistic importance, being contemporary works of Byzantine mosaicists sent into Italy.

illustration of Byzantine degeneracy. A native of Greek Syria, he showed a thorough receptivity of Greek culture, betraying only in his language that he had

**The Great
Author of
Justinian's Time**

been educated on the outskirts of the Hellenic world. A sceptic towards Christianity, he lived in an artificially archaic superstition, cherishing the ideas of Herodotus about dreams and portents. He was impressed with the grandeur of the Roman world and the necessity of ruling it by law; he wished to keep up the old ordinances and to place more power in the hands of the upper classes.

Therefore he, in contrast with the Roman, Anastasius, hated the barbarian on the throne, Justinian, who ruled according to his own caprice, subverted old ordinances, and in his legislation gave preference to the lower strata of the population. Classical

antiquity lived anew in the vigorous Syrian author. He far excelled his ancient models both in the variety of the sources which he used and in his ethnographical studies, which had become indispensable for the mixed population of Byzantium. His "History of the Wars" is based on extensive inquiries and the personal experience which he had acquired as private secretary and assessor of Belisarius. His "Secret History," composed in 550, agrees mainly with the "History of the Wars," although he relates in it everything which his hatred of Justinian and Theodora suggests, and all that the vulgar gossip of the court offers him, on the model of Suetonius.

He disclosed no new facts, but insinuated everywhere the meanest motives. The treatise on the buildings of Justinian, written certainly by order of the emperor in 560, contains such highly coloured praise of Justinian that we may fairly suspect the author of an ironical intention. The book, which caused great

satisfaction, brought him the prefecture of Constantinople.

Menander, who was intended to study jurisprudence, had begun at an early age to lead a desultory existence, and to devote his attention to the disputes of the factions in the theatre and the dances of the pantomimes, such as he describes in his splendid preface. It was only on the accession of the emperor Mauricius, the guardian of his people and the muses, that Menander began to realise his own powers and to write his history, treating the

**Menander's
Literary
Powers Awaken**

period 558-582; he conveys important information, especially about the embassies of Zemarchus to the Turks. Nevertheless, he did not think he could afford to challenge comparison with the brilliance of Procopius. His descriptions are plain and unadorned but excellent: as,



FATE OF BELISARIUS, THE GREATEST BYZANTINE GENERAL
The legendary fate of the great Byzantine warrior was to fall from power and, being blinded and bereft of his possessions, made to wander, a beggar, through out the land. He had a guide, but the youth was killed by a snake bite, and Belisarius, not knowing him to be dead, carried his body for a time. This, of course, is the legendary story; but that Belisarius died in poverty and neglect is history.



RUINS OF THE TRADITIONAL PALACE OF BELISARIUS, THE GREAT BYZANTINE WARRIOR
A palace of Constantine the Great, in Constantinople, reputed afterwards to have been the residence of Belisarius.

for instance, of the three tents in which Zemarchus dined on three successive days: the walls hung with bright silken tapestry, holy relics in various forms, golden vessels, the Turkish ruler on a golden couch supported by four gilded peacocks, silver figures of animals on his chariot, in no respect inferior to the Byzantine. Menander's special merits lie in his love for painting miniatures and his comprehension of great events.

The poet Agathias of Æolis felt himself to be, in his historical works (552-558), the successor of Procopius as an artistic exponent of current history and the ancient historical style. Quite different was the position of John Malalas, who addressed the mass of the people in his "Universal Chronicle," reaching to 565, perhaps to 574, and produced the greatest effect by a popular work of the first rank composed in a homely Greek dialect. Not merely his Syrian countrymen but also the Greek historians, and even Slavs and Georgians, made use of this invaluable monument of Byzantine popular wit.

It is important, not merely from the critical standpoint, to indicate these sources for the history of Justinian's age; they give us a full picture of the intellec-

tual movement of the time, in which the higher intellectual classes still appear as patrons and guardians of all classical treasures, but in which also the masses, in the modern sense, with fresh life pulsing through their veins, struggle for their share in culture, and create their own homely picture of the world in a Greek language which had assimilated Latin and Oriental elements. Thus the "motionless" Byzantine life must be relegated henceforth to the sphere of historical fable no less than the "unchanging" character of Egypt and China.

Neither the nephew of Justinian, Justinus II. (565-578), whom the senators proclaimed as his successor, nor Tiberius (578-582), the captain of the palace guard, who, at the recommendation of the empress Sophia, was raised to be co-regent in the lifetime of Justin, could continue on an equal scale Justinian's dream of empire. Tiberius was the first genuine Greek to mount the Byzantine throne, which, since the overthrow of dynastic hereditary succession—leaving out of consideration the Isaurian Zeno I.—had been occupied by Romanised barbarians of the Balkan peninsula. This is a significant event; it illustrates the

growing importance within the empire of the Greek nationality. This nationalist movement is traditionally connected with the emphasis laid by Mauricius on the use of Greek as the political language.

Justin, it is true, refused to pay tribute to the Avars, a people who, after entering Upper Hungary through Galicia, had occu-

Byzantium's Italian Provinces Lost

pled in Iazygia, between the Theiss and the Danube, the homes of the Gepidæ, in Pannonia those of the Lombards, and who exercised a suzerainty over Bohemia, Moravia, Galicia, and later over Moldavia and Wallachia. But after the loss of Sirmium in 581 the northern districts were lost for Byzantium. The Lombards, in a rapid victorious progress, conquered in Italy during the year 568 Forum Julii, Vicenza, Verona, and all Venetia with the exception of the coast. The next years saw piece after piece of the Byzantine dominion in Italy crumble away; in 569, Liguria and Milan (without the coast and Ticinum) and Cisalpine Gaul; in 570-572, Toscana, Spoleto, Benevento, Ticinum, and the future capital Pavia; in 579, Classis. These Lombards, behaving otherwise than the east Goths, broke with the old traditions of the empire; they did not recognise the Byzantine suzerainty, and founded an entirely Germanic state on Roman soil, so that in these years the West Roman empire was more completely destroyed than in the traditional year 476. On the scene of war in Persia alone did the year 581, so disastrous for Byzantine power in Europe, bring a victory to Constantine, the defeat of the Persians under Khosru at Tela d' Manzat.

In the first half of the sixth century a new and powerful empire had been formed in the East, with which Byzantium was bound to cultivate good relations—the empire of the Turks. The name of the Turks first occurs in an inscription of 732

Byzantium's Relations with the Turks

A.D. This inscription was set up by a Chinese emperor in honour of a Turkish prince; but outlying fragments of the Turkish race, as early as the fourth century B.C., at the time of Alexander's Scythian campaign, can be traced on the Jaxartes, where the brother of King Karthasis simply bears the Turkish designation kardashi (his brother); in fact, the main body of the Turks was known to the Greeks of the seventh century B.C. by

caravan intelligence, as the report of Aristæas of Proconnesus shows. The branch of the Turks which then became powerful was connected with the Hiung nu; its home in the sixth century A.D. was the east coast of the Chinese province Kansu, near the southern Golden Mountains. The embassy of a Turkish vassal, Maniak, came to Byzantium; in 568 and 576 Greek envoys stayed at the court of the chief of the northern Turks, Dizabul (or Silzibul; Chinese, Ti teu pu li), at the foot of the northern Golden Mountains (the Altai), and concluded a treaty with them. Menander furnishes a detailed account of these embassies and of the ensuing treaties, which gave the Byzantine empire a good base in Central Asia.

Mauricius (582-602), the victorious general of the Persian War, became also the successor of Tiberius. He was of Græco-Cappadocian birth, nominally of an old Roman stock. A second Persian war brought many successes in the field, but disappointing terms of peace, in 591. Mauricius, who himself had risen to the throne by a military career, must have seen the difficulties which beset the Byzantine provinces of Italy and Africa through the separation of the military and the civil powers. Thus the military governors of these two provinces were granted the new and magnificent title of exarch, coupled with extraordinary powers. The creation of exarchs was the starting point for the further organisation of the military provinces.

Mauricius, on the other hand, was not in a position to protect the northern frontier of the Balkan peninsula, which Avars and Slavs continually inundated. Not only did the North become completely Slavonic, but invading Slavonic hordes settled even in Greece, where a considerable intermixture of races can be proved. The Slavs were undoubtedly the ruling power in Greece during the years 588-705. Hellenism was still more driven into the background in consequence of the plague of 746-747; as the emperor Constantine VII. Porphyrogenetus says: "The whole country (Hellas) became Slavonic and barbarian."

The capabilities of the Slavs had been already recognised by Justinian in his military appointments. Dobrogost was in 555 at the head of the Pontic fleet; in 575 Onogost became a patrician. Priscus,

RISE OF THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

the conqueror of the Slavs, who defeated the general Radgost and took captive King Muzok in 593, availed himself of the Slav Tatimir in disposing of the prisoners. A Slav, Nicetas (766-780), mounted the patriarchal throne of Constantinople; descent from a distinguished Slavonic family in the Peloponnese is ascribed to the father-in-law of Christopher, son of the emperor Romanus I. Lacapenus; but the Slavonic descent of the Armenian emperor Basilius, asserted by the Arab Hansa, is obviously as untrustworthy as the fable of the "Slav" Justinian related by Theophilus.

We must see in these expeditions of the Avars and Slavs a true national migration which flows and ebbs. Capable generals, like Priscus, inflicted heavy reverses on both nations; but on one occasion only the outbreak of pestilence in the Avar camp saved Constantinople, and the demands made on the army increased enormously. It mutinied and raised to the throne the centurion Phocas (602-610), who put Mauricius and his five sons to death. But this arrogance of the army led to popular risings, especially in the native

Justinian's Age Ends in Murders country of the emperor, Anatolia and Cilicia, then in Palestine, Syria, Egypt, and above all among the monophysites.

The Persians attempted to avenge Mauricius, and a peace with the Avars had to be concluded at any price. But the Byzantine standard of government had long been too high to tolerate permanently on the imperial throne an incapable officer of low rank who dealt with insurrections in the most merciless fashion. Priscus, the general, allied himself with the exarch Heraclius of Africa, and the latter became emperor. The age of Justinian had ended in murders; the dissolution of the empire would soon have followed had not the sword rescued it.

The attacks of the Persians on the Byzantine empire at the time of the emperor Heraclius (610-641) tore from the Byzantines not merely Syria and Egypt, but also, in 619, the important town of Ancyra in Asia Minor. But it seemed a more terrible blow when, in 615, the Holy Places and the Holy Cross fell into the hands of the infidels. Three crusades brought war into the heart of Persia; the battle of Nineveh, on December 17th, 627, was decided in favour of the Byzantines, so that the Roman provinces reverted to them, and

on September 14, 629, the festival of the Elevation of the Cross was celebrated at Jerusalem by emperor and people with great solemnity. The conflict raging in the East made it impossible to retain the Spanish possessions or the territories lying to the north of the Balkans, but the capital itself, in 626, proved the bulwark

Persia and the Crusades of the empire against Avars and Slavs, and the wise policy of Heraclius raised a dangerous foe against them in the shape of the Bulgarians. It was shown, however, that the Persian danger had become formidable for the reason that isolated sections of the empire, through their ecclesiastical separatism and the formal institution of a Coptic and Syrian national Church, no longer remained loyal to Byzantium, and saw welcome allies in the Persians, while in Egypt the orthodox were contemptuously styled the "royalists." The formula of the One Will, or Monotheletism—"the God-Man consisting of two natures has achieved all things by one god-like operation"—more closely resembled the doctrine of the One Nature of the monophysites; consequently a reconciliation was effected through the diplomacy of the king, which extended even to the Armenians.

The condemnation of this doctrine by Sophronius, the patriarch of Jerusalem, shattered the concord, which was hardly yet established, as violently as the entirely inappropriate attempt at reconciliation made by the emperor in his edict. Consequently the Syrians, in 635 and 636, and the Egyptians, in 641-643, fell a prey to the invading Arabs as rapidly as the Roman citizens in the West yielded to the Germanic invaders, although in Egypt the treachery of the governor contributed mainly to the surrender of the country. Economic reasons may have co-operated, since the political and social structure of the Arabic empire gave great power to the conquerors. Constans, the grandson of Heraclius (641-668), whose kinsmen had been castrated according to the Oriental custom, was able to retain Asia Minor and even to exact tribute from the Arab caliph Muaviya; his success was due principally to the transformation of the empire into military provinces, which had already been instituted under Heraclius. Great

importance attached to the military governors in Africa and Italy, and the critical times had compelled Heraclius to form the capital and the adjoining provinces into a military district; the Thracian province had to carry on the war against the Bulgarians, the Anatolian and Armenian the war with the Arabs,

State and Theological Quarrels

and the fleet was soon divided into two commands—on the south coast of Asia Minor, and the twelve islands. The regency during the minority of Constans attempted to end the theological controversy by the Edict of the Typos in 648, according to which the subjects of the empire "no longer are permitted to dispute and quarrel anywhere over one Will and one Operation, or over two Operations and two Wills." When Pope Martin I. condemned this edict in 649 at the Lateran Council, and Maximus, formerly imperial private secretary, stirred up Roman Africa against Cæsaro-papism, the emperor banished the pope to the Crimea, and ordered Maximus to be brought to trial. It was then that the bronze statues of the Pantheon were carried off from Rome by Constans. The island of Sicily, which was strongly Græcised by immigration, was intended to become the base for the recovery of Africa from the Arabs, who had taken it in 647. But an expedition from Syracuse, the capital, succeeded only in capturing Carthage.

Under Constantine IV. Pogonatus (668-685), son of Constans, Constantinople had to defend itself against the Arabs (April-September, 673), which it did successfully, owing mainly to the Greek fire of the Syrian Callinicus; and Thessalonica was attacked by the Slavs (675) and Avars (677). The greatest danger to the empire seemed, however, to be the Bulgarian kingdom under Isperich, in which the Turkish conquerors gradually adopted the language of the subjugated Slavs. In view of all these

Futile Effort to Regain North Africa

dangers, the ecclesiastical connection with Rome, which was effected in 680-681 by the sixth œcumenical council in Constantinople, was intended at least to secure moral support. Justinian II. (685-695, 705-711), had, it is true, concluded a treaty on favourable terms with the Arabs and had conquered the Slavs; but serious

political, military, and economic mistakes led to the mutiny of one of the generals, Leontius (695-698), by which the sovereignty of the army was once for all established.

Under the two generals now elevated to the purple, Leontius and Tiberius III. (698-705), Africa and Cilicia were lost. Justinian, who had taken refuge with Isperich's successor, Tervel, was brought back by a Bulgarian-Slavonic army; he wreaked vengeance with an insane fury on his enemies. He fought without success against Bulgarians, Arabs, and the revolted town of Kherson. The Armenian Philippicus (711-713), who was raised to the throne as a rival, and Theodosius II. (715-717), successor of the able Anastasius II. (713-715), proved themselves equally incapable.

The voice of literature was dumb in that rough age. It produced strong natures, and a pious superstition led them to battle. Andrew the Apostle comes to the help of the citizens of Patras, borne on his galloping war-horse, and drives the Slavs to flight. St. Demetrius of Thessalonica is the god of the city, who imitates Christ in every detail. He changes the purpose of God to deliver over the town to the opponents; he is the guardian of the city, the "prescient grace"; indeed, he aspired to be the Third Person with Christ and the Holy Ghost.

The miracles of St. Demetrius are a valuable source of information for this age, when the Slavs navigated the Greek waters in their primitive boats, interrupted trade and communications, and, accompanied by their wives and children, inundated Pannonia, Dacia, Dardania, Mysia, Thracia, Achaia, and the suburbs of Constantinople itself. The country population streams into the towns or migrates to lonely capes, and founds isolated settlements. Greeks and Slavs grow into a mixed race, which fills the depopulated regions, once more colonises the deserted islands, and even mixes with the Bulgarians in the north. Sword and crosier rule the Greek world, in which old pagan traditions crop up on the surface; science and art are almost entirely silent in the regions of Europe and of Asia Minor.



CIVILISATION OF THE EARLY BYZANTINE EMPIRE

THE LINK BETWEEN THE EAST AND THE WEST

CONSTANTINOPLE, Byzantium, or New Rome, was, like Old Rome, divided into fourteen districts; even the seven hills could, to the satisfaction of some Byzantine students of history, be rediscovered, if required, by the exercise of some imagination, within the limits of Constantinople itself. The old patrician families, who had lived on the Bosphorus since the days of Constantine, might, as regards the games in the circus, which were accurately copied, cherish the belief that no alterations had been made in the customs of Old Rome. The military system, the strength and pride of the Romans at a time when the army no longer consisted of Italians, or even the subjects of the empire, still remained Roman at Byzantium. The only difference was that in the seventh century the word of command became Greek; and in this connection the old word "Hellenic" might no longer be employed, having degenerated into the meaning of "pagan." The old traditions of the Roman senate, extolled more than five hundred years before by eloquent Hellenic lips as an assembly of kings, were cherished in the New Rome.

Roman Culture Continued in Byzantium

The East Roman senate preserved a scanty remnant of the sovereign power, since it claimed the formal right of ratifying a new emperor. The political ideal of the Byzantine Empire, was Roman, only diluted into an abstraction by a tinge of cosmopolitanism. Huns, Armenians, Khazars, Bulgarians, and Persians were employed in the army. The employment of such mercenaries, and constant later intercourse with the governments of Arabia and Persia, helped largely to give the Byzantine Empire, in intellectual and ethical respects, the stamp of an Oriental empire. Not merely was the imperial office conceived as a mystery which might come into publicity only on extra-

ordinary occasions amid the most splendid and most ridiculous pomp; even the western feeling of personal dignity slowly died away, and occasional corporal punishment was quite consistent with the exalted position of the Byzantine nobles.

Revival of Oriental Ideas

The stiffness and pedantry of the state based on class and caste, in the form which Diocletian had given it, had precluded any new stimulus from below. The upper classes would have remained in the ruts worn deep by the lapse of centuries, devoid of every powerful incentive, had not religious disputes offered opportunities for the assertion of personal opinion, while the intrusion of Oriental influences, the revival of Oriental ideas on art and law, caused an agitation like bubbling springs in standing pools.

Not merely did the Asiatic governors possess a higher rank than the European; even Orientals, especially Armenians, acquired an ever increasing importance at court and in the army. Among the leaders of the latter, Manuel (under the emperors Theophilus and Michael III.) and John Kurkuas (940-942, commander-in-chief against the Arabs, "the second Trajan") are especially famous. Even the pearl diadem of the East Roman emperors repeatedly adorned the brows of Armenians, and once fell to an Arab, Nicephorus I. A grand-daughter of Romanus I. married in 927 the Tsar Peter of Bulgaria. The Ducas family and the Comneni prided themselves on their relationship to the Tsar Samuel of West Bulgaria, an Oriental in spite of his European home. In the veins of the Empress Irene, after 732 wife of Constantine V., there flowed Finnish blood; she was the daughter of the chief, Khakhan, of the Khazars. The khan of the Bulgarians was made under Justinian II.

Oriental Increase in Power

a patrician of the empire, as was a Persian of the royal house of the Sassanids. The Byzantine general, with whose battles the shores of the Black Sea echoed, and whose glory an epic of the tenth century rapturously extols, Basilius Digenis Acritus, was son of the Arabian Emir Ali of Edessa by a Greek wife. The family of the Arabian Emir Anemas in Crete was in the service of John Tzimisce, while George Maniaces, who reconquered Sicily in 1038, bears a Turkish name. In order to obtain an idea of the strange mixture of Oriental and Western life, let us consider the appearance which Constantinople itself would present to a stranger in the time of the Emperor Justinian.

As we skim over the glittering water of the Bosphorus in a Byzantine dromond, we see, rising above the gentle slope of the Nicomedean hills, the snowy peaks of the Bithynian Olympus, a fitting symbol of Asia. But on our left hand the mighty capital with its palaces and domes enchains the eye. From behind the strong ramparts which guard the shores, between the long stretch of the hippodrome and the various blocks of the palace, the Church of Holy Wisdom, "St. Sophia," towers up, its metal-covered cupolas glittering like gold in the sunlight. In the gulf of the Golden Horn our boat threads its course through hundreds of dromonds and smaller vessels; when safely landed, we must force our way through the motley crowd, and reach the church of St. Sophia through a seething mass of loose-trousered turbaned Bulgarians, yellow and grim-faced Huns, and Persians with tall sheep-skin caps. Forty windows pour floods of light on the interior of the church; the sunbeams irradiate columns gorgeous with jasper, porphyry, alabaster, and marble; they play over surfaces inlaid with mother-of-pearl; they are reflected from the

**A Graphic
Picture of 1,000
Years Ago**

rich golden brilliance of the mosaics in a thousand gleams and flashes. The want of repose in the ornamentation, the deficiency of plastic feeling, and the prominence which is consequently given to coloured surfaces are emphatically Oriental; not less so are the capitals of the pillars, stone cubes overlaid with ornament, in which we must see a reversion to the traditions of Syro-Phœnician art, and the pattern of the

mosaics, where the after-effect of a style originally Chinese, and later Perso-Syrian, is seen in the network of lozenges.


A walk round Constantinople confirms this impression. By the side of the golden throne of Theodosius huge Egyptian pylons tower up; we pass by immense water-tanks constructed in the Syrian fashion, and glance at the columned cisterns, which are of Egyptian origin. If we enter the house of a noble we find the floor, according to the immemorial tradition of the East, paved with glazed tiles; the furniture covered, so far as possible, with heavy gold-leaf—a revival of Assyrian fashions, which through Byzantine influence reached even the court of Charles the Great (Charlemagne). We notice on the silk tapestries and carpets strange designs of animals, whose childishly fantastic shapes might be found in the Farthest East.

The products of the goldsmith's craft, pierced and filled with transparent enamel, point also to Oriental traditions, no less than the extravagant splendour of the nobles and their wives who inhabit these rooms. Gold, precious

**The Ancient
Marvels of
Constantinople** stones, or transparent enamel, glitter on the long tunics of the men, on their richly-ornamented

chlamydes and even on their shoes, while their swords are damascened in the primitive Assyrian fashion. The ample robes of the women are thickly covered with embroidery; broadsashes encircle their waists, while narrow embroidered capes hang down from their shoulders. These fashions recur at the court of the later Carolingians, who are shown to be Germans only by the fashion in which they dress their hair.

The immense imperial palace is a city in itself, a city of marvels. The inhabitants of the rustic West who visited the Cæsars of the East were amazed, as if the fables of the East had come to life. The golden spear-heads of the bodyguard carry us back in thought to the old Persian court, the splendid colours of their robes are borrowed from the East. A mysterious movement announces some great event; the clang of the golden bell and the deep-toned chant of the priests herald the entry of the Basileus. If an envoy were admitted to an audience in the imperial hall, his eye would be caught by another relic of the Persian court, the golden plane-trees, which rose high into the air behind the



THE CHURCH OF CONSTANTINE, NOW A MOHAMMEDAN MOSQUE.

A Mohammedan mosque dedicated to a saint seems strange; but "Saint Sophia" signifies "Holy Wisdom." It was originally built by the Emperor Constantine, and was, of course, a Christian church, but it was not destroyed by the Moslems. On the contrary, the Christian effigies were left untouched, and the name of the Saviour is still among the prophets honoured therein, as we have seen on page 2,885. The interior of St. Sophia is a magnificent sight.

throne; artificial birds fluttered and chirruped, golden lions roared round the throne; in the midst of all that bewildering splendour sits immovable a figure, almost lost in costly robes, studded with gold and jewels, more a picture, a principle, or an abstraction than a man—the emperor. Everyone prostrates himself at

Wonders of the Gorgeous Orient

the sovereign's feet in the traditional eastern form of adoration. The throne slowly moves upwards and seems to float in the air. Western sovereignty had never before attempted so to intoxicate the senses; the gorgeous colouring and vivid imagination of the East were enlisted in the cause of despotism. If we go out into the street again we hear a stroller singing a ballad which the populace has composed on the emperor in Oriental fashion.

This composite art of Byzantium thus represents a decomposition of the Græco-Roman style into its original Asiatic elements, and a fuller development of these in a congenial soil. The wonderful Greek sense of form was gone, and the style of the Roman Empire had disappeared, if it ever existed; the concealment and covering of the surfaces, the Oriental style of embroidery and metal plates, had become the Byzantine ideal.

In other respects also the intellectual life shows effeminate and eastern traits. The authors make their heroes and heroines burst into tears or fall into fainting fits with an unpleasing effeminacy and emotionality, explicable only by Oriental influences. Not only the novelists but even the historians, with that lavish waste of time peculiar to the Oriental, describe their personages in the minutest and most superfluous detail. This habit of elaborate personal descriptions was a tradition of Græco-Egyptian style, due to the same craving for the perpetuation of the individual which produced mummy portraits on the coffins of the dead, and caused wills

Byzantium Thoroughly Orientalised

to be adorned with the testator's picture. In the domain of "belles lettres" the fable and the adventurous travel-romance of the Indians were interwoven with late Greek love stories, so that motifs which first appear in Indian fables spread thence to the West, where they can be traced down to Boccaccio's Decameron. Byzantine architecture shows close dependence on the Arabian models. The emperor Theophilus (829-842) had his

summer palace built at the advice of John Grammaticus, who was well acquainted with the Arabs, on the model of the caliph's palace at Bagdad, while in the palace of Hebdomon the decoration of the Arabs was imitated.

The West faded out of the Byzantine range of vision, while the nations of the East attracted more attention. Procopius of Cæsarea relates strange notions as to the appearance of Britain. When the Book of Ceremonies, which treats of the procedure with foreign rulers, mentions the princes of Bavaria and Saxony, it states that the country of the Niemetz belongs to them. Little more was known of the Germans in 900 than the name given them by Magyars and Slavs, and the ambassador of the emperor Otto I. sat at table in the Byzantine court below the Bulgarian ambassador.

The eastern countries, on the other hand, came more and more clearly into view. The historian Theophylactus Simocattes drew in 620, presumably through the good offices of the Turks—instructed by the letter of the khan of the Turks to the emperor Mauricius, which envoys had brought to Byzantium in 598—an able sketch of China, congratulated the Chinese, in reference to the Byzantine disputes as to the succession, on being ignorant of such matters, and spoke enthusiastically of Chinese law, praising especially the rule which forbade men to wear gold or silver. The legend that Alexander the Great was the founder of the two largest Chinese cities appears also in his writings.

Thus the new influences which now came into play had long existed in the lower strata of Oriental society, or had their origin in Oriental spheres outside Byzantine national life.


While the southern provinces of the Byzantine Empire maintained in general a brisk intercourse with the East, the enthusiastic East Roman patriot Cosmas Indicopleustes journeyed from Egypt to India, which he described in vivid colours. Syria especially offered a *jardin d'acclimation* for western and eastern suggestions and ideas, and continued to do so, even after the Byzantine dominion was destroyed in 640 and the Arabs took over the country. Græco-Roman culture had been completely victorious there under the Roman Empire; the sound of the old

CIVILISATION OF THE EARLY BYZANTINE EMPIRE

Aramaic national language was heard only in isolated villages. Christianity, as a genuinely democratic power, had adopted the discarded language of the mother country and the people, and soon raised it to the rank of a universal language. The achievements of Greek intellectual life were translated into Syrian.

Syro-Greek writers, whom we can with difficulty classify as true Syrians, with rights of voting as Byzantines, as Syrians of a stock which had long been Græcised, and as Greeks of old descent, stand in the forefront of the intellectual life of Byzantium. Romanus the Melode (about 500), the most celebrated hymn-writer of Middle Greek literature, was a native of Syria. That country produced numerous historians: Procopius of Cæsarea; John of Epiphanea, who knew Persia thoroughly; Evagrius Scholasticus (about 600); John Malaias (Syrian *malal* = *rhetor*), for whom, although Byzantium was the political capital,

373), heads the list of Syrian dogmatic theologians, to whom, among others, Anastasius, a native of Palestine by birth, belongs as a "precursor of scholasticism" labouring in Syria. Ecclesiastical interests are further represented in the domain of exegesis by Procopius of Gaza; under this head are counted the friends of the historian Evagrius, Symeon Stylites the ascetic, with his glorification of the monastic life, and the ecclesiastical orator



THE OLD BYZANTINE WALLS OF CONSTANTINOPLE



RUINS OF JUSTINIAN'S PALACE AT CONSTANTINOPLE

Antioch was always the intellectual focus; and John of Antioch. In the domain of grammar, the versatile John Philoponus of Cæsarea, Sergius of Emesa, the zoologist, and Timotheus of Gaza were busily occupied. Aōtius of Amida, in Mesopotamia, subsequently imperial body-physician, belonged to the same race, although he is said to have begun the study of the ancient physicians at Alexandria. His nearest countryman, Ephraim (306-

Gregory, patriarch of Antioch. Syria thus played a part in early Byzantine literature which was altogether disproportionate to the number of her inhabitants.

Aristotle was introduced into the schools and expounded; the philosophy of Pythagoras and Plato and the sonorous eloquence of pseudo-Isocratean speeches were once more subjects of study; the physician Sergius of Ras'a-in did especial service in this department. Later writers also, such as Severus of Antioch, John Philoponus, Porphyrius, Sextus Julius Africanus, Eusebius, the

Apology of Aristides, were translated; Persian and Hebrew writings were brought within the scope of Syrian studies. Legends, such as the Invention of the Cross, the Seven Sleepers, and the Baptism of Constantine come from this source. Some "Episodes from the Lives of Saintly Women" were written on the pages of a gospel in Old Syrian. The last story among them contains the temptation of Yasta of Antioch by the scholastic Aglaidas, who,

after his suit had been rejected, applied to the magician Cyprianus. The latter is bound by a compact signed in blood to a demon, who now undertakes to win over the maiden, but has to acknowledge himself defeated before the sign of the cross. Cyprianus, convinced of the inefficiency of self-acquired wisdom, and impelled by

Eastern Source of the Faust Legend

his thirst for truth, then abjures all magic. This legend of Cyprianus, which certainly arose on Syrian soil, has become important for the west in many ways through the effect of the Faust legend and of the material which lies at the bottom of Pedro Calderon's "Magico Prodigioso."

Syria again was successful in propagating her own culture far to the east and west. Syrian Christians were settled on the coasts of India, on the Himalayas, and in Ceylon, and exercised a deeply felt influence on India. Memories of it are echoed in the Indian epic Mahabharata; the legends of the birth of the demigod Krishna and of his persecution by Kansa, the Avatars system, probably an imitation of the Christian dogma of Christ's descent to earth, and the adoration of Krishna's mother, Dewaki, are speaking proofs of it; while the appearance of the Greek astronomer Ptolemy as Demon (Asura) Maya and the numerous technical terms in Indian astronomy can be explained only from the connection with Alexandria. Whether the Syrian Christians of India really maintained so close an intercourse with the west that King Alfred of England could send them an embassy is still a moot point.

Syrian missionaries penetrated into the mysterious highlands of Central Asia. When China was ruled by the great Emperor Tai Tsung (627-649), before whose command Northern India bowed, whose help Persia implored, enthusiastic Syrian missionaries appeared there. A tablet, composed in 781 in Chinese, but containing some lines of Syriac, which was found in 1625 at the

famous Singan fu, testifies both to the religious zeal of the Syrians and to the tolerance of the Chinese emperor, who had ordered the translation and circulation of the Scriptures, and had commanded a church of the pure faith to be built. Incidentally, it shows that the supposed political embassy of the Byzantine regents to China during the minority of Constans II. (about 642), was nothing more than a mission sent by the Syrian Nestorians.

Syrian sepulchral inscriptions were discovered in 1885 from the soil of the steppes of Turkestan in the vicinity of Issik kul. Just as man in the earliest times paid reverence to the tombs, in order to rescue from oblivion the memory of his dear ones, and to form some bond between the existence he knew and the mysterious world beyond the grave, so even the poor Turks of Semirjetchje have since the ninth century utilised the Syrian language and letters to perpetuate the recollection of their departed.

Widespread Commerce of the Syrians

From this influential position of the Syrians, who, being then in full possession of western culture, must be claimed also for the west, it is plain that the alphabet of the Manchu Uigurians and, through the agency of the latter, the alphabet of the Mongols, are derived from the Syrian script; the circumstances in particular under which the Syrian-Nestorian script came to the Uigurians are well known to us from the

monument of Kara Balgassun.

An equally important rôle was played by the Syrians in the west. Jerome had already said, "Their lust for gain drives them over the whole world; and their frenzy for trade goes so far that even now, when barbarians are masters of the

globe, they seek wealth amid swords and corpses, and conquer poverty by risking dangers." As a matter of fact we find Syrians scattered far and wide, not only before but also after the fall of the West Roman empire. Tyre, the metropolis



TYPE OF BYZANTINE CHURCH ARCHITECTURE

CIVILISATION OF THE EARLY BYZANTINE EMPIRE

of Phœnician commerce as far back as the eleventh century B.C., and now in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. it had become the great centre of the silk trade—Sidon, and Berytus send their merchants especially to Italy. Inscriptions in various towns prove their existence in the kingdom of the Franks.

We find Syrians in Narbonne, Bordeaux, Vienna, Lyons, Genay, Besançon, Orleans, Tours, La Chapelle Saint-Eloy, Paris.* On German soil they appear at Strassburg, Trèves, Rheinzabern, and in Bavaria; in England at South Shields.

They were the carriers of the wine trade and of the Egyptian papyrus trade; they encouraged horticulture and brought plants from their own country, of which only the shallot—so called from the name of the town Ascalon

—need be mentioned. They circulated the silk stuffs manufactured in their own workshops; these show Persian patterns, especially the two horsemen, as a centre, but the surfaces are filled up in the Syrian fashion—with vine tendrils, vine branches with ivy leaves and grapes—or they chose genuinely Syrian themes. Syrian ideas for pictorial ornamentation accordingly reached the West. The Gospel-book of Godeskalk, painted between 781 and 783 for Charlemagne, contains a picture, in the Syrian style, of the fountain of life, with animals, like the Bible of the Syrian monk Nabula produced in 586. Syrians transmitted to the West the story, originating in India, of the king's son who takes no pleasure in pomp and show, and, chafing at the nameless sorrow with which men's hearts throb, flies into solitude in order to atone for himself and mankind by devotion to a new doctrine which may redeem the world. In that story of Barlaam and Josaphat Europe actually possessed a sketch of the life of Buddha before it became acquainted with Buddhism.

It was, moreover, from Syrian and not from Greek tradition that the West derived the Alexander legend. Some main features of the earliest form of the Faust myth may, as already stated, be traced back to the Cyprian legends current in Antioch. After surveying these rich

results of Syrian brokerage we cannot be surprised that Syrians were employed by Charlemagne for the revision of the text of the gospels, which he himself had planned.

The East Roman province of Syria still performed the function of an intermediary, even when Syria itself, through the Arabic conquest, no longer recognised the suzerainty of Byzantium. The Arabs, even before this, had been subject to the influence of the Græco-Byzantine mode of life, especially

ally the Arabs of Khirat and Ghassan.

Architects who, if not Greeks, were schooled in the art traditions of Greece, built on the far side of the Jordan in the territory of Moab, one and a half days' journey east from Jericho, the palace of el-Meschetta for a Sassanid. The division of the walls by zigzag lines in high relief is as non-Semitic as the six-sided or octagonal rosettes in the angle spaces. So, too, the vine branches springing from a vase, which rise symmetrically upward and display a wealth of leaves, point to the Oriental embroidery style which was developed in Byzantium. The details correspond as much to Old Byzantine models—for example, the drums of the pillars in the Tchiniti-kiosk—as to Middle Byzantine motifs—for example, the design on the marble panelling of the Panagia church at Thebes. But in their strong yet delicate technique the reliefs of el-Meschetta resemble only the Old Byzantine art, and date certainly from the fifth or sixth century. The ruin of el-Kastal (Castellum), which lies in the



SYRIAN CHURCH OF THE FIFTH CENTURY
This, compared with the picture on page 2924, shows how Syrian architecture was affected by that of Byzantium.

Byzantine
Influence in
Architecture

neighbourhood, was, according to a trustworthy tradition, built by the Sassanids; and a ruin to the east of Damascus (Khyrbet el-Beda) may probably be assigned to the same period. Into this close intercourse, in which the Byzantines appear as the givers, we gain a vivid insight from bilingual and trilingual inscriptions of the period. South-

The Syrian Missionaries at Work

east of Aleppo in the plain of Jebbul still stand the ruins of a basilica, in which we can recognise the usual ground plan, the great central nave, the two side aisles, the apse to the east, and the main door to the west. This basilica contains inscriptions in Greek, Syrian, and Arabic commemorating the foundation in the language and script of each of the three sections of the community—namely, the ruling official class; the ordinary population; and the northern Arabs, who had already penetrated this region and had been Christianised by the Syrians. The most ancient linguistic monument of these Arabs is this inscription of Zebed. Since the fathers still bear Semitic names, but their sons actually the name of the martyr Sergius, perhaps the work of conversion was then proceeding. Another Græco-Arabic inscription from Harran in Trachonitis dates from the year 568.

The Arabs come on to the scene as a completely uncivilised people of the desert. Byzantine trade therefore satisfied their growing needs. For this reason they measured with the Greek pound (litra), and when they themselves went among commercial nations they called their warehouses by the Greek name. Oriental fruits were known to them under Greek names. Finally, the Bedouins called the sheet of paper by the Greek name. When, therefore, a great power was formed from the Arab tribes, there is, notwithstanding the propagandist zeal of the Arabs, a proof-discernible, even in religious relations, of the degree to

How the Arabs Acquired a Touch of Greek Culture

which the Arabs were conscious of this transference of culture. Omar prays on the steps of the church of Constantine in Jerusalem, although he declines the invitation of the patriarch Sophronius to perform his devotions in the church.


The economic and legal systems of the Arabs were strongly influenced by Byzantium. They employed at Damascus, Baalbek, and Tiberias Greek coins with the

simple imprint of the name of the town. When they minted money for themselves, it was struck according to the Greek monetary scale, and occasionally, as in the case of the so-called Heracleian Dinars, with Latin inscriptions. They concluded contracts for hire or lease according to the models which Byzantium gave them, and, according to the Roman custom, did not release their sons from their guardians until they were twenty-five years old.

If a Byzantine, after the conquest of Syria by the Arabs, looked down from the old caravan road on the Anti-Libanus upon the paradise in which Damascus, a vast sea of houses, glittered among a green circle of gardens, he might, at the sight of the cupola-crowned mosques, which were still occasionally built by Greek architects, and which always retained the cruciform structure, cherish the belief that this bright land from the serrated Gebel el-sheikh to the burning desert was yet under the dominion of Greece. All the more if he went into the plain and saw Arab troops, armed after Byzantine fashion, marching past in Byzantine formation; if he entered the houses in the town and found everywhere replicas of the Roman gateway and the open courtyard; and if, finally, he visited a Syrian harbour, and saw the Arab ships built on the model of the Byzantine dromond.

Greek artists and workmen exerted in many ways this Byzantine influence on the Arab empire. Thus, as Abd ur-Rahman ibn Khaldun in 1406 records, the Caliph Velid received at his own request from the Greek emperor in the first decade of the eighth century architects in order to rebuild the church of St. John in Damascus; Greeks were employed to reconstruct the mosque of Medina. Christian, and therefore certainly Greek, architects were probably employed on the Kubbet es-Sakhra and on the Jami el-Aksa, which in the central portions resemble Justinian's church of St. Mary.

Most remarkable, however, is the late and distant influence of Byzantine culture in Spain, where Abd ur-Rahman III. (912-961), according to Makkari, employed Byzantine workmen. This transmitted civilisation is especially evident in the shrine of the mosque at Cordova. The mosaics of this temple, glittering with gold and bright colours, were, according to



THE INFLUENCE OF BYZANTINE ART IN SPAIN: THE MOSQUE OF CORDOVA
 An example of how the art of Byzantium, so essentially Oriental, reached into Spain, is seen in the mosque of Cordova, where the marvellous mosaics are said to have been made by Greek workmen sent from Byzantium by the emperor

Edrisi (1164-1165), executed by Greek workmen whom the emperor had sent from Byzantium. The iron gates and the fountains of Cordova, like the bronze fountain of Zahra, are emphatically Greek. Byzantine influence extends even to the smaller objects of art; an Arabic casket in the Louvre, with an inscription which mentions

Alexandria the Intellectual Centre of the Empire Almog ueina (a son of Abd ur-Rahman) certainly shows signs of it. So, too, the Byzantines

assisted in transmitting Greek science to the Spanish Arabs; the translation of Dioscurides was carried out only by the help which the Byzantines afforded to the Arab scholars engaged upon it, and by the co-operation of a Jewish linguist.

Thus the first movement towards influencing and civilising the Arabs by Greek culture came from Syria and the Syrian nation, and was perhaps continued from Alexandria, the city which down to the seventh century may be still regarded as the intellectual centre of the Byzantine empire. In Egypt, the Arabic art of ornamentation had adopted the universal elements of the late antique, as is shown by the palm frieze, the waving vine shoots, and the acanthus leaf in outline in the Ibn-Tulun mosque at Cairo. Here, too, we may possibly trace local influences, and the effect of the late antique tinged with Byzantinism. The central power in Constantinople had often on its own initiative influenced intellectual progress; for example, by the despatch of Byzantine workmen, of whose nationality we are unfortunately ignorant. In many cases this transmission of culture was rendered possible only through the strong imperial power.

Just as the influence of Byzantinism on the Arabic world came first from Syria, so the Syrian transmission of culture paved the way for the influence of Byzantium on Armenia. The main conceptions, with their terminology, of western civilisation, political imperialism, and

Syrian Religious Influences religious martyrdom, may have already reached the Armenians directly from the sphere of Greek civilisation, proving that there was an early intercourse with Greece in the first three centuries; but Syria supplied the most essential links in the chain.

The founder of the Armenian Church, Grigor Lusavoric, united it to the Syrian ritual, and employed, as Moses of Khorene tells us, Syrian letters for the Armenian

language, and nominated the Syriar David as superintendent of all the bishops. Even when we disallow the alleged Syrian origin of the Armenian creed, there remains sufficient to attest the Syrian religious influences, since it is dependent on the pseudo-Athanasian creed. Among the schools attended by young Armenians, Edessa, owing to its accessibility and its splendid library, was given the preference over Constantinople and Alexandria.

Monasteries and episcopal palaces were founded in Armenia by Syrians; numerous Syrian writings were translated into Armenian; and Syrian patriarchs stand at the head of the Armenian Church, even though not universally recognised; Syrian bishops are found in Armenia down to the sixth century. Art products, Syrian miniatures, were introduced into Armenia. The miniatures in the Etchmiadsin Gospel-book in the details of the ornamentation, in the employment of plants and of birds on the sides of a vase, as well as in the representation of scriptural types such as the message to Zachariah, the Annunciation, and the Baptism of Christ are so closely connected with the Syrian Bible

Armenian Nationalism Encouraged of the monk Rabula of 586 that we must assume an older Syrian copy. Both in politics and in culture Armenia was for a long time less closely connected with Byzantium than with the Byzantine province of Syria. An alliance had certainly been concluded in 323 between the founder of Constantinople and Khosru II., the son of Tiridates the Great. But Valens soon found it more advantageous to make common cause with the Persian Shapur II. against Armenia in 374. The Armenians, who were subject to Byzantine dominion, may have no longer required the Syrian alphabet. But the national union of the Armenian people took place under the auspices of Byzantium. A national Armenian alphabet was designed by the holy Mesrob in 441 in Syrian Samosata. Six pupils of the Armenian Catholicus came in 432-433 to Constantinople, in order to master the Greek language.

It is possibly the case that, when the Catholicus Sahak (384-386) wished to collect also the Armenians of the west for this national propaganda, a refusal was received from the Byzantine governors. The protest of the Catholicus, and the answer of the emperor, who had countenanced the acceptance of the Armenian

CIVILISATION OF THE EARLY BYZANTINE EMPIRE

alphabet, are preserved in Moses of Khorene, but can hardly be genuine. The consciousness of the necessity for a transmission of culture triumphed over conflicting political and religious interests. The Armenians borrowed from the Greek almost all their written literature and their church music; in recognition of this intellectual dependence, the emperor Theodosius II. and his all-powerful sister Pulcheria gave these zealous translators both literary and financial help.

The Armenian patriarchs were educated in "Greece," that is to say, in Byzantium. Giut, patriarch from 465 to 475, emphasises his intellectual dependence on Byzantium, whence he obtained his material requirements, such as clothes. It is recorded of Nerses III. (640-661) that he had been educated in Greece. At least two churches and one monastery had been built by Justinian in Armenia, and others restored; and in the post-Justinian era the chief church of Etchmiadsin with its cupolas had been erected. Nerses III. even later built a church in the vicinity of the town of Walarchapat, of

Mutual Dislike of Byzantines and Armenians which some pillars are still erect and show his monogram. These capitals exhibit the corbel of Justinian's age, but Ionic flutings in place of the Byzantine animals, a renaissance, as it were, of older Greek ideas in a Byzantine setting.

Even towards the middle of the eighth century, in a disquisition on the question of admitting images into the churches, we find the emphatic statement that, even in the domain of painting, all productions can be traced to the Greeks, "from which source we have everything." It is true that national hatred prevailed for centuries between Armenians and Greeks, so that under the emperor Heraclius the armies would not encamp side by side; and Byzantine proverbs declared that no worse foe existed than an Armenian friend, while the talented historian Casia drew an alarming picture of the Armenian national character. Yet the influence of Byzantium on Armenian literature and architecture, and the importation of images from that source, give the keynote to the relations between the two nations.

Armenian courtiers, Armenian officers, Armenians in the administrative and the legislative departments at Byzantium had, by correspondence with their homes and their relations, opened a hundred channels

through which that higher civilisation, as expressed in language, flowed into Armenia. Greek words crowded first into the learned language of Armenia. Meteorological phenomena were called by Greek names; so, too, were minerals; mathematics, astronomy, chronology, jurisprudence required to borrow words from Greek. Expressions for the business of Church and State were to a large extent first adopted by the learned class. But soon popular borrowings must have co-operated in that direction, and with the words for man, his qualities and occupations, and for the ideas of nature, town and country, money, weights and measures, house and home, dress and ornament, arts and games, a strong Greek element was introduced into the Armenian language.

Armenian influences first brought Byzantine culture nearer to the Caucasian nations; the Georgians—like the Bulgarians, Servians, Russians, Wallachians—adopted the Greek church music, both vocal and instrumental. The princes of independent tribes were proud of Byzantine titles—as, for instance, the prince of the warlike Alani in the Caucasus, on whom by the favour of Byzantium the title of Mighty Sovereign was conferred; others were styled Archons. Thus here, too, in the East a wide sphere of Byzantine influence was created, which was in many ways, not all of them superficial, imbued with a higher civilisation.

Notwithstanding the strong inclination of individual Persian kings towards western civilisation, the effect on Persia of any special Byzantine, as apart from Greek and Roman, influences, can as yet hardly be demonstrated. It has, indeed, been long observed that the palace of the Sassanids at Ctesiphon, which dates from Khosru I., as far as the construction of the façade and the mural decoration are concerned, displays the same round-arched arcades and pilasters as Diocletian's palace, and that the goldsmith's art has remodelled Roman motifs; thus, a dish shows an Eros, playing the lyre, seated on a lion, but in Oriental dress. But these influences are in reality so universal that it is better to speak of a transmission of the late antique. At most, the trapezium-shaped capitals may be traced back to Byzantium, while the

Persia Owes Little to Byzantium

acanthus decoration on a capital at Ispahan still shows the Hellenistic form.

It seems difficult to investigate the early influence of Byzantine culture on the West. So long as the belief prevailed that Old Roman or "Old Christian" art alone fructified the West, it was impossible to submit the monuments to an unbiased examination. Since

Byzantine Influence in the West we know that Græco-Oriental influences were at work in the West, even before they were transmitted by Byzantium, the "Byzantine" question becomes more complicated. Nevertheless, we may consider in this connection the influences of individual Oriental spheres of the Byzantine empire, so far as they have not been already discussed in dealing with the importance of Syria.

Byzantium and the states of the West bear towards each other in matters of culture the same relation as the left to the right lobe of the brain, or the right to the left half of the body, which are very differently provided with blood. On the one side, we have states which laboriously extricate themselves from the effects of the national migrations and the fall of the West Roman empire; rustic populations with isolated towns and no commerce; nations which by hard struggles try to build up their own constitution on the ruins of the Roman empire; monarchies which can alone supply this want, but cannot make head against the conditions of the age; aspects of development which cannot yet create any advanced culture.

On the other side is a polity which, after the institution of the genuinely Germanic empire of the Lombards on West Roman soil, appears as the sole heir of immemorial traditions of world-empire; an empire which alone could follow out an imperial policy as distinct from the momentous and yet locally restricted conflicts of

The Germanic States and Byzantium the Germanic empires; a well-organised bureaucracy, based on the practical experience of centuries of political existence; a community which possesses a capital of unparalleled magnificence, numerous flourishing cities, and a well-organised commerce, embracing the whole civilised world, which had absorbed all the refinement of Hellenistic Roman and Oriental culture; a Church in which were ex-

emplified all the principal types of religious organisation; a communion in which all the struggles for the settlement of Church dogmas had been fought out with passionate obstinacy. On this side the Germanic states; on that, Byzantium.


Whether the Frankish coins are stamped with the name of Tiberius or Mauricius, whether the envoy of the emperor Anastasius confers on Clovis the consular title, and thus promotes him to be the lawful ruler over his Roman subjects, or whether the negotiations of Tiberius bring treasure and revenue to Chilperic and Gundobad, or Lombard dukes undertake to assume Byzantine dress—Byzantium always appears as the old and wealthy civilised power face to face with the poor upstart.

The last will of the emperor Mauricius, who divided the East and Italy—with Rome as capital—among his sons, may have been only a dream of the old world-policy; but assuredly Byzantium was not content with idle dreaming. The great land-owning families of Italy, from whom sprang the commanders of the Byzantine castles—the Tribunes—saw in Byzantium the sun of all civilisation; the severance

Western Gateways for Eastern Culture of the provinces of Lower Italy and Sicily, which were now more strongly Græcised, and so had

entered on a completely divergent development, met the wishes of their ruling classes. Naples as the port for Rome, and Ravenna as the centre of Byzantine administration, are the great gates by which Byzantine influence enters Italy; in this connection Istria may be reckoned as a thoroughly Byzantine region, within which religious ideas, political organisation, and art—e.g., the cathedral at Parenzo—show the closest affinity with Byzantium. Marseilles, on the contrary, retained its old Oriental connections and directly transmitted to Western Europe the influences of Syria and Egypt. So also did Montpellier in a less degree.

Byzantine administration, the head of which in Italy, the exarch of Ravenna, received his instructions in Greek, helped much to spread Greek influence. Still more effective were religious ideas and the influence of the clergy and the monks. We must realise that, while in Ravenna Syrian bishops are found during the first four centuries only, in Rome there are eight Greeks and five Syrians among the popes between 606 and 752. Græco-Oriental



BYZANTINE ART IN ITALY: THE FAMOUS MOSAICS OF RAVENNA

Ravenna, in Italy, was one of the chief centres of Byzantine influence in the west, and the churches of San Apollinari and San Vitale there are rich in mosaics made by artists from Byzantium in the sixth century. The first mosaic here reproduced, shows Christ enthroned between angels, and a group of saints to the right. The second is the enthronement of the Virgin and Child. The third illustrates the sacrifices of Abel and Melchisedec, with Moses and Isaiah shown above.

monasticism spread first over Central and Southern Italy, and conquered further regions of the Christian world. The Greek Theodore of Tarsus, from 669 onwards, reformed the Anglo-Saxon Church, and transmitted a rich civilisation to England; and in France, as in Italy, this Greek spirit had much effect on the construction and the decoration of the churches. The Greek bank of the Tiber (Ripa Græca), the Greek school at Santa Maria in Schola Græca (later in Cosmedin), and the founding of the monastery of San Silvestro in Capite by Pope Paul I. (757-767), where Greek church-music flourished, may suffice as illustrations of Hellenistic influence in ecclesiastical and commercial spheres. The foreign trade of Byzantium also contributed largely to the spread of the Græco-Byzantine culture. In this connection the Syrians, who, according to Gregory of Tours, mostly spoke Greek, may be regarded as disseminators of Byzantine civilisation.

The fresher vitality of the east, which had formerly forced Constantine to Orientalise the empire, soon dominated everything in Rome itself. The motifs of Oriental art are to be seen in the mosaics of Santa Maria Maggiore towards the middle of the fourth century, and in the marvellously carved wooden door of the church of Santa Sabina, which shows the Syrian conception of the crucifixion; finally, also in the transept of the basilica of San Pietro in Vincoli, which Eudoxia commanded to be built in 442. The old Byzantine art had then firmly planted itself everywhere in Italy. The arts and crafts of Constantinople enjoyed so excellent a reputation that the bishop of Siponto, a kinsman of the emperor Zeno, sent to Constantinople for artists "especially skilled" in architecture. At Ravenna, Byzantine craftsmen were employed as early as the time of Galla Placidia.

The building operations of Narses and Belisarius in Italy—the bridge over the Anio on the Via Salaria Nova, the Xenodocheion on the Via Lata, and the monastery of San Juvenale at Orte—were certainly carried out by Byzantine workmen. The cycle of mosaics of San Vitale at Ravenna, begun after 539, was executed under the immediate influence of Justinian, in order to glorify the dual nature of Christ, and in

special illustration of a Biblical line of thought which was, undoubtedly, of Oriental origin, and found in the West its most brilliant representative in Ambrosius of Milan. The churches of Ravenna reveal to us the importance of Byzantium as linking East and West; these Chinese tessellated patterns, which developed from woven fabrics into mural decorations, appear here just as in the St. Sophia in Constantinople and in Thessalonica.

Again, clothing, court manners, minor arts, and tapestry were affected both in the West and at the court of Charlemagne by Byzantium itself. Byzantine gilding at the court of Charles is praised in the poem of Angilbert addressed to him, while the Byzantine custom of guarding the women is mentioned by Theodulf. The throne of Charles at his tomb in Aix-la-Chapelle is thoroughly in keeping with the Byzantine gold-plate style. A four-sided wooden platform covered with metal and studded with jewels, and a portable altar (a wooden frame overlaid with plates of gilded lead), show this style of facing. The Byzantine origin of the inlaid

tables mentioned by Einhard cannot be asserted with equal certainty. Oriental carpets and silk stuffs were exported in quantities from Byzantium, which had established a monopoly of silks and satins. The courtiers of Charlemagne obtained, according to the "Monk of St. Gall," their silk robes trimmed with purple through Venetian traders from the East—certainly therefore from the Byzantine empire



A BYZANTINE MADONNA
This example of the Byzantine treatment of the Mother and Child is to be seen in the church of St. Mary the Great at Florence.

CIVILISATION OF THE EARLY BYZANTINE EMPIRE

Quantities of woven goods which imitated Persian patterns were sent out from Byzantium over the whole of Western and Central Europe. Even in the eleventh century Byzantium appears as the intermediary for this art industry. The ivory workmanship of Byzantium not only conquered Italy, but its distinctive features appear again in the art of the West. Even in the diptychs Byzantine realism predominates—as, for instance, in the representation of fights between wild beasts and of other contests of the arena; but in

the upper part the solemn ceremonial dignity of the Old Byzantine art prevails. Even the flat treatment of the reliefs of that epoch points indirectly to Byzantium. Small ornaments of daily use must have been sent out of Byzantium in quantities; in Hungary, as well as at Reichenhall, are to be found those peculiar rings with a drum-shaped casket, the lid of which is ornamented by a row of filigree pearls, and a glass bead in the centre. Byzantine jewellery reached the Swedish

island of Oeland and West Gotland. The golden diadem from Färjestaden certainly dates from the old Byzantine era.

Byzantine coins came far into the west and north, and supply strong evidence of the world commerce of Constantinople; we need instance only the finds in Westphalia, Holstein, Usedom, Gotland and Bornholm. If the Byzantine monetary system, as regards smaller coins, in its recognition of the Oriental local coinages as legal tender and in its special respect for Egyptian drachmas, is true to the main principles of Byzantine imperial administration, the Byzantine gold currency, which was

universal in Europe until the appearance of zechins and florins, testifies to the strong position of the world trade and the financial power of Constantinople.

Finally, Byzantium's influence was far-reaching in the domain of military history, and certainly affected the empire of the Franks. The successes won by the Byzantines over their enemies, not in great battles, but by a clever policy of delay, must have made a great impression in the West. The cavalry had played the most prominent part in all active operations under

Leo, Constantine, and Irene; in war with nations of horsemen, the cavalry regiments and not the old legion came to be the backbone of the Byzantine army; they were recruited from Armenians, Iberians, and the inhabitants of Asia Minor. These lancers, who were clad in iron—they wore the iron cuirass, the gorget of mail, iron gloves, greaves and boots—with their short lance, their sword, their javelin, and their plumed helmet, were the models for the cavalry of the Frank

empire. The name also, *Cabellarius*, the armament and the harness (compare the Byzantine saddle in the cathedral treasury at Troyes), were then introduced. Men armed with bows and arrows after the style of the Byzantine mail-clad horsemen appeared in the levy of the abbot Fulrad in 810.

Reverence for the culture of Constantinople pervaded the western world. Church and State, arts and crafts, world-wide commerce and military science, co-operated to guide the rays toward the West. Even for that age the saying holds good, "Ex oriente lux."



ANCIENT BYZANTINE IVORY CARVING

Carved ivory cover for copy of the Gospel, dating from the fifth century



SKETCH MAP OF THE GREAT EMPIRES BETWEEN THE YEARS 777 AND 814 A.D.



DAYS OF THE IMAGE-BREAKERS AND THE CLEAVAGE OF CHRISTENDOM

NOW that the enemies of Byzantium were pressing on, and Byzantium's share in the commerce of the world was shrinking and financial distress widespread, the only salvation lay in a strong government. Leo, the Isaurian, who had distinguished himself against the Arabs as a general and diplomatist, was raised to the purple (717-741). He entered Constantinople on March 25th, 717. Maslama, the general of Suleiman, appeared before the city on August 15th. Leo's unwearying energy, the Greek fire, and a hard winter, whose snow covered the ground for one hundred days, caused terrible privations among the Arabs. While the Byzantines could catch fish, the Arabs ate the flesh of baggage animals, skins, or the leaves from the trees. Greek tradition, not satisfied with this account, preserved in Tabari, made the Arabs feed on human flesh. A severe defeat which the Bulgarians inflicted on the Arabs finally caused the abandonment of the siege of Constantinople in August, 718. Byzantium had thus proved herself the bulwark of Christianity. The year 718 may be compared with the year 490 B.C. as an epoch in the history of the world; the withdrawal of the Arabs in 718 is a parallel to the retreat of the Persians after Marathon.

The old fiscal system of the caste-state of Diocletian and Constantine, in which, according to the law of 319, the municipal councillors (Decuriones) were responsible for the entire land tax of their community, had been handed down to the Byzantine empire. If, according to this arrangement, heavy responsibility on the one hand weighed down the great landowners, on the other hand they had large powers and important influence over their colleagues in the towns. It was a masterly measure of the emperor Leo III. when he took that onerous duty, which had increased in the years of insecurity, away from the Curiales; but by so doing he

also destroyed their importance for a long period. Henceforth imperial revenue officials were appointed to conduct the collection of the land tax. Imperial officials henceforward kept the register of male births for the poll tax throughout

**Promoting
the Country's
Prosperity**

the empire. The emperor, solicitous for social prosperity, ameliorated in many ways the position of the country population. Every proprietor of a village community shared the responsibility for the taxes; a deficiency was made up by an additional charge, which was imposed upon all. Since all suffered from the bad economy of one individual, a right of pre-emption was allowed to the neighbouring cultivators in the event of plots being sold.

Distinct from these small landowners were the free labourers, the "adscripti" on the estates of great proprietors; the former were always free as regards their persons, but became after thirty years bound to the soil. The latter were at once bound to the soil, could not inherit any property, and differed little from the slave save in their marriage being legal. The Agricultural Act of Leo III. radically altered this state of affairs. The country labourers were now divided into those who paid a tithe, and "metayer" tenants, neither of them bound to the soil. The former were required to render the tenth part of the produce as ground rent; the latter, who worked the soil with the means provided by the owner, shared the produce with him. Village communities owned the soil in common; private ownership existed

**Communal
Ownership
of the Soil**

only in consequence of a partition of some property held in common. Abolition of compulsory service and the concession of the liberty to migrate are the great achievements of this legislation. It was profoundly affected by eastern models. Its resemblance to the Mosaic code as regards the nine sheaves and the period of seven years was noticed long ago; it

was assumed that the idea was adopted from the Bible. The discovery of the code of the Babylonian king Hammurabi has supplied another solution. Not merely do metayer tenants occur in the old Arabic and Semitic sphere of civilisation, a fact which by itself would prove nothing, but there is a surprising similarity in particular

Influence of the old Semitic Laws regulations. Such are those about the restitution of waste land in the fourth year, which, though divergent, still spring from the same school of thought; those as to the cultivation of land and the felling of timber without the knowledge of the owner; and those as to the restitution of land which had been cultivated in the absence of the owner—a provision in contradiction to the right, conceded by Justinian, of acquiring the ownership of a field after two years' cultivation of it. Thus the agrarian policy of the emperor Leo was in particular points influenced by Semitic principles of justice, which had been maintained in a conservative spirit, although the necessity of a reform of the system of colonisation was rendered imperative by the numerous new settlers, especially Slavs. With regard to the free village community, Slavonic influences are certainly to be assumed.

The Rhodian maritime law, according to which the skippers and charterers in those times of bad trade shared the risks already increased by Slavs and Arabs, recurs in its main principle to the rule of Hammurabi, according to which the skipper must make everything good to the charterer in the event of an accident through negligence. Some not yet quite intelligible references appear finally in the criminal code, so that even there, in view of the great prominence of the "Lex Talionis," some Semitic influence might be assumed. This victorious increase in the strength of Semitic undercurrents is hardly surprising at a time when the Syrian nationality,

Guarding the Life of the Family from which the emperor Leo himself sprang, was drawing East and West under its spell. The legislation of Leo handled family life in a spirit very different from that of Justinian's code, which intruded on the emotional side of the relations between parent and child when it defined the grounds on which parents might cherish resentment against their children. We see everywhere a delicate consideration and respect for the intimacy of family life.

The position of the wife is, with a fine feeling, ameliorated. The *patria potestas* (paternal authority) becomes the authority of both parents, since the mother's consent is needed no less than the father's for the marriages of the children, and since the mother possesses generally the same rights over the children as the father, and, on the death of the father, retains them in virtue of her position as their guardian.

The community of property between married couples indicates the high conception of matrimony as a community of life which may not be degraded by the contraction of a third marriage, and may not be carelessly dissolved by separation without stringent reasons. A noteworthy idea appears at all events in the "Ekloge" (or Selection of Laws). Marriage is allowed only between Christians of orthodox belief, and is much complicated by the extension of the impediment of spiritual affinities—for instance, the prohibition of marriage between the son of the godfather and the godchild. This was an ecclesiastical notion, which constantly gained ground, and soon afterwards, even amongst the Germanic nations, made sponsorship an impediment to marriage even in the Capitularies of Pepin (755-757). The necessity of a Christian marriage contract was a rule certainly borrowed from the Oriental regions of the Byzantine empire. It is in keeping with the idea of the dignity of marriage, and with the new taste for a solemn and dignified formalism.

Leo, himself raised to the throne as a general, wished to weld together the empire with links of iron; but he had to cure the paralysis produced by the existence of a civil administration which no longer served any useful purpose. In these warlike times the commander in the field could not be hampered by civil authority, however feeble. Thus the commanders of the military districts, called *Themata*, received also the full civil power. The importance of the Anatolian command necessitated its division into the Anatolian *thema* of the *Bucellarians*, and the Thracian, which embraced Asia, Lydia, a part of Caria and Phrygia, and got its name from the regiments on garrison duty there. To maintain military discipline and keep up the learning of the past, which had led to the actual invention of "Greek fire," seemed equally imperative. One emperor met these needs, as far as possible,

by publishing the "Tactica," a book on military science, in which the author treats of military law and of land and naval warfare, adhering closely to previous works; but since the fresh spirit of the reformer does not breathe in this book, the writer was probably not the great Leo, but a successor, Leo VI.

It required disciplined valour and knowledge to restore the army and the empire to their old position; it was therefore a serious danger that in Syria towns and individuals trusted to images and amulets in time of war. The society in which Leo had grown up at Germaniceia, on the borders of Cappadocia, Syria, and Armenia, must have had close relations with the Paulicians, whose capital Samosata lay so near. Mananalis, near Samosata in Commagene, is the home of that Constantine who, as Silvanus, in 660 revived the sect of the Paulicians (presumably an Armenian form for Paulians, after Paulus of Samosata in the fourth century). Cibossa in Armenia, Phanaræa in Helenopontus, became the headquarters of these sectaries, who imported the primitive Aryan dualism of good and evil into the Christian doctrine, rejected any distinct priesthood, and regarded each individual as a priest; and, finally, in their strict conception of the idea of God, refused the worship of the Virgin as well as that of the saints. The religious attitude of the emperor Leo III. was probably largely influenced by this sect.

How far had men gone in these centuries of dispute? The worship of the saints had confused the conception of the Deity. The belief in miracles brought its most dangerous offshoot, superstition, into power. While in some parts of the empire the saints appear like the gods and heroes of antiquity, and, hastily concealing their original form, bring victory in battle, in others, attempts are made, as in the town of Pergamus, to win strength by most revolting practices—as, for example, by dipping the hand in a broth of human flesh. The lifeless images of Christ, Mary, and the saints are more esteemed than the living faith. Their importance becomes perfectly clear to the traveller in modern Russia, the heir to the Byzantine empire, where the eyes are wearied by innumerable icons of the Iberian Mother of God, and copies of the icon on Mount Athos. It had become

a universal habit to scrape off the colour of the pictures and mix it in wine, and to honour images with incense, prostrations, and kisses.

The old paganism, which still continued in the festivals of Pan and Bacchus and dominated certain districts of Greece, was finally prohibited at the council of 692; but the images "made without hands," as the usual phrase ran, enjoyed the most profound reverence.

The old paganism had found its way into Eastern Christianity. The emperor Leo III., a thinker far in advance of his age, waged a bold warfare against image worship, and by so doing struck a blow, not merely at the mass of the people, but, above all, at monasticism, which influenced the masses by image worship, and lived to some extent on the trade in sacred pictures.

This great controversy has been handed down to us in a distorted form by later advocates of images, or Iconodules: such were Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople (806-815), and Theophanes, a monk who drew in part from the same sources, and wrote between 811 and 815; he was kept in confinement by Leo V. on Samothrace. The "Papal Letters" to the emperor Leo III. may afford some idea of the state of feeling, but that is all; they are ascribed to Gregory II. (715-731), but are the forgeries of some later writer, who was badly informed in matters of political geography and topography.

But even from these scanty accounts the energy and moderation of the emperors shine out conspicuously. Unity of religion and purity of religion hover as twin ideals before the eyes of the man who was influenced neither by Judaism nor Islam, but by Paulicianism. The command was issued to Jews and Montanists that they should change their religion; the former submitted, the latter preferred to die. Whereas, one of the heads of the Paulicians, Genæsius, after his orthodoxy had been tested, obtained a letter of protection; the zeal in conversion flagged when this sect came in question. In 726 the struggle for religious purity began: the first edict of Leo ordered that the images should be destroyed. And the schools, the hotbeds of superstition, which conducted the education of the young on the old lines, were fated to fall. Tradition

affirms that the school in the Iron Market was burnt to the ground, professors, books, and all. When, therefore, a celebrated image of the Redeemer was being carried away by imperial officers, some fanatical women attacked and killed them—an exploit which greatly delights the author of the pseudo-Gregorian

Educated letters. Stronger measures
Classes Steeped were imperative, not against
in Superstition the masses, but against the educated classes, who supported the struggle for superstition.

The pressure of taxation and enthusiasm for image worship drove Greece and the islands of the Ægean into a revolt, which led to the election of an emperor (Cosmas) and to the advance of the insurgents to the gates of Constantinople in 727. The movement was soon crushed by the Greek fire and the superiority of the imperial fleet. At the assembly of the year 729 the patriarch Germanus was sacrificed. He, the supporter of image worship and the monks, retired, and in his place was chosen Anastasius, who now solemnly ratified the ecclesiastical policy of Leo. Anastasius was not, however, recognised by Pope Gregory II., who entered into dangerous relations with Charles Martel. Italy turned against the Iconoclasts; insurrections seemed likely to tear the whole peninsula away from Byzantium, and the papal authority of Gregory II. and Gregory III. partially supported the anti-Byzantine agitations. Matters were not, however, allowed to go so far as the election of a rival emperor.

An armada was despatched by Leo against Italy, but was wrecked in the Adriatic. Under these conditions Leo, in 733, set about restoring ecclesiastical unity in his empire. He separated Sicily and Calabria (Rhegium, Severiana, Hydrus-Otranto) ecclesiastically from Rome, and placed them under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. The property

Increase of of the Church was confiscated. In this way the
Power to the Græcising of Lower Italy
Eastern Church and Sicily, begun under the

emperor Constans II., was carried a step further, and Southern Italy was left in a position to develop on her own lines far differently from the North. This Græcising process was again extended by the immense immigration of Greek monks (estimated at 50,000), who now came over and settled, with their images "not made by

men's hands," in the freer atmosphere of the western dominions of the empire.

Equally important appears the removal of an old obstacle to development which concerned Illyria. When Valentinian as emperor of the West ruled over Illyria also, it was only natural that Pope Damasus (366-389) should exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction over this region, the thoroughfare between West and East. But when the Illyrian prefecture was attached to the East under Theodosius in 379, Rome still maintained this spiritual jurisdiction, and the metropolitan of Thessalonica was appointed the representative of the apostolic chair; when, later, Mœsia and Macedonia were transferred to the bishop of Ochrida by Justinian, even then these two provinces remained ecclesiastically one with Rome. This last relic of the encroachment of Roman ecclesiastical sovereignty over the dominions of the Byzantine empire was now abolished by Leo III., and Illyria placed under the patriarch of Constantinople.

The severance of Isauria from the patriarchate of Antioch, and the subjection of these ecclesiastical provinces to the patriarchate of Constantinople, broke down the barriers between political and ecclesiastical sovereignty, between the boundaries of the Byzantine empire and the diocese of the œcumenical patriarch. No foreign spiritual jurisdiction was to be recognised within the borders of the Byzantine empire.

The emperor Leo comes before us as a man in advance of his age. The advocate of a free peasantry, a supporter of the marriage tie, a stern foe to superstition, a champion of the rights of the state against the Church, a military reformer—his public energy fills us with deep regret that we cannot penetrate his real personality. Could we do so we should doubtless rank him as one of the greatest figures of the Byzantine empire. Himself his own finance minister, certainly his own commander-in-chief, a man whom the Church celebrated in her chants as her liberator from the Arabs, impelled by affectionate recollections of his home even in the domain of law, which he wished to be administered gratuitously to the poor; finally, in the sphere of religion, a firm, clear-headed character, who represented primitive Christianity enthu-

siastically and rejected every compromise with paganism—behind the politician in significant outlines stands revealed the man in all his greatness.

The son of Leo III., Constantine V. (741-775), nicknamed Copronymus, undoubtedly raised the bitterness of the image controversy to the highest pitch. Perhaps the cheerful strain in his nature—for he loved music, dancing and feasting, and ordered fruit, flowers and hunting scenes to be painted instead of sacred subjects—the gentleness which forgave his daughter Anthusa for worshipping images, the solicitude which procured pure drinking-water for the capital by the restoration of the aqueduct of Valens, were deeply planted in him and were his true characteristics.

Yet he was harsh, for he confined Stephanus and 342 monks in the Prætorium; and cruel, for he ordered eyes to be put out, arms, ears, noses to be cut off, and men to be executed and their dead bodies to be dragged through the streets. The treachery of his brother-in-law Artavasdus (from Mara'sh in Commagene, 743), and the opposition of the monks to the proscription of images which the council of 754 had officially pronounced, and therefore to the emperor and the Church, had kindled in him a wild desire for revenge. The fanaticism of the freethinker who no longer tolerates the title of "holy," and is deeply incensed at the exclamation "Mary, help!" impelled him, after 761, into a savage war against the monks, in whom not merely image worship but also the "spiritual state" within the state was most clearly personified. The phrase "The monk, not I, is emperor," was wrung from the furious Constantine. There was no statutory abolition of the monasteries, though this has been inferred from the fragment of the patriarch Nicephorus in a manuscript of Theophanes, but separate enactments of Constantine confiscated monasteries and bestowed them without documentary record on laymen, from whom they could again be taken at pleasure.

It was a time of ferment and of agitation; new germs were developing in a rough age of strife; the terrible plague of 745 to 746 had almost depopulated the capital, and therefore Greek settlers were summoned to Byzantium from the islands and Hellas; and Hellas itself and Thrace

offered new fields not merely to the imperial colonists from Syria and Armenia, but to the immigrating Slavs themselves. Slavs were then settled in Bithynia—to the number of 280,000—and in Cyprus. Did the celibacy of the monks incense the emperor at this period of depopulation? It is certain that he was deeply indignant when his nobles sought monastic retirement. Skilfully contrived campaigns and breaches of faith were the weapons with which Constantine fought against the Bulgarians. After the sovereigns from the family of the Dulo and other Bulgarians—of whom a list down to 765 is preserved in a Slavonic text with Old Bulgarian phrases—we find rulers whose names, Paganus and Sabinus, attest the prominence of the part played by the Wallacho-Bulgarians. Cerig, or Telerig (763-775), in the end outwitted Constantine and wheedled out of him the names of all the Philhellenes in Bulgaria, who were then at once put to death.

Constantine's son, Leo IV. (775-780), surnamed the Khazar after his mother, carried on the ecclesiastical policy of his father in a milder form. The oath of fealty was ordered to be taken to his son Constantine not merely by the provincial governors, ministers and senators, and all the soldiers present, but also by representatives of the artisan guilds, and other classes of citizens. Constantine's mother, Irene, an Athenian, did not swear fealty to him. In 788, when he was eighteen, she annulled his betrothal with Rotrud, the daughter of Charles the Great. Finally, she put out his eyes in 797. For the next five years she ruled herself. A tedious contest between her favourites, a lamentable attitude towards the Arabs, and complete retreat in the question of the image controversy form the salient points in her reign. The œcumenical council of 787 enjoined the worship of images as a duty; although the state right of supervision was not waived. Hence the image controversy ended in favour of the image worshippers (Iconodules) and of monasticism, and all the results of Leo's efforts were wiped out. None more sharply criticised this Church council of Nicæa than Charlemagne. There is sufficient evidence to recognise that Charles held the same views as the Byzantine emperors Leo III. and

Constantine V. The objection of Constantine to the invocation, "Mary, help!" and such phrases can be paralleled by similar criticisms on the part of Charlemagne. Thus he stigmatises as blasphemous the phrases of the Byzantine chancery style, "God rule with them," "God entreat the Pope to co-operate," etc. It was, he said,

Charlemagne foolish to light before the
Denounces images candles which they
Image Worship could not see, or burn
incense which they could
not smell. To the lifeless images, which are
only works of men's hands, no adoration is
due, such as was shown to living men—a hit
at the Cæsar-cult of Rome and Byzantium.

The papacy, unchecked by dogmatic
variances, threw itself into the arms of the
Franks. The flight of Pope Leo III. to
Spoleto and the romantic meeting of
Charles and the Pope at Paderborn, where
the mail-clad horsemen headed by Charles
galloped forward amid the clash of trum-
pets to meet the Pope, led to the wonderful
coronation on Christmas Day, 800 A.D., in
St. Peter's. The legal question of the
precedence of the Byzantine emperor,
which even Alcuin in 799 had acknowledged
in a letter to Charles, was not settled by
this ceremony, but only shelved, for the
view of the Lorsch Annals that the ques-
tion was ended when the imperial title
passed to a female did not appear to have
any legal foundation.

The successor of Irene, who was soon
deposed, was Nicephorus, the treasurer-
general (802-810). The Syrian or Isaurian
dynasty was overthrown, and a new house
came up. The mere fact that a man once
more filled the imperial throne of Byzan-
tium made it impossible to maintain the
argument, upon which the coronation of
Charles as emperor had been based, that
there was a vacancy in the empire. Nice-
phorus received overtures for peace from
Charles, and left them unanswered. It was
only when Venice, which, having revolted

Bulgarian from Byzantium in 806, had
Empire returned again in 807, was
in Being punished by Pepin for so doing
in 810 that Nicephorus sent
Arsafius his representative to conclude a
preliminary peace. Charles in his letter
to Nicephorus rejoiced that it had at last
become possible to realise the wish for
peace. But when the envoys of Charles
reached Byzantium the skull of Nice-
phorus was already serving the great
Bulgarian prince Krum (802-814) as

a drinking-cup; Krum had conquered
almost all the European possessions of
Byzantium, had in particular won Sofia,
and after some preliminary successes of
Nicephorus had defeated the emperor and
his whole army.

This Bulgarian empire comprised at
its heart Lower Mœsia (between the
Balkans and the Danube), extended
over the territory of the modern kingdom
of Roumania, absorbed Transylvania,
the salt of which the Bulgarians exported
to Moravia, and extended to the Dniester,
possibly to the Dnieper. The princes
lived at Preslav (Marcianopolis) on the
great Kamcija. Islam seems to have
been preached in the ninth century; but
the influence of the subjugated Slavs, who
transmitted their own language and cus-
toms to their rulers, and only assumed
their name, was stronger. Greek culture
soon began to influence the Bulgarians.
Even in the eighth century a Bulgarian
prince had counsellors who spoke Bul-
garian, Slavonic, and Greek. They fought
with Greek siege-machines and with Greek
fire. Inscriptions were composed by them
in Greek, though no longer classical Greek.

Hellenic Thus, on a pillar of red marble
Influence on still preserved in Tirnovo,
Bulgarians Omortag (between 820 and 836)
explains his plan for construct-
ing a palace and a sepulchral monument
after a Greek model.

After the incapable Michael I. Rhangabé
(811-813) had sustained a decisive defeat
from Krum in the vicinity of Adrianople
in 813, the emperor Leo V., the "Chame-
leon" (813-820) was able at last, in 817,
to conclude peace with Omortag. Leo was
also successful against the Arabs; less so in
the deposition of the patriarch Nicephorus
and in the organisation of the synod of
815, which revived the almost buried
image controversy. The agitation which
had once been religious now led to the
sharpest persecution, and ceased to be a
movement in favour of liberty.

Leo V., the "Chameleon," had, in his
time, when he accepted the crown, been
under-estimated by the man who succeeded
him, Michael II., the Phrygian (820-829),
who had given the hesitating officer the
choice: "With this sword I will open the
gates of Constantinople to you, or I will
plunge it into your bosom." The king-
maker, showing dissatisfaction with his
secondary position, had been arrested; but
now breaking prison he murdered his former

THE DAYS OF THE IMAGE - BREAKERS

protégé in the royal chapel, into which he and his companions, dressed as priests, had forced their way.

His rival in power, Thomas the Slav, was the instigator of the most dangerous revolt of the subjugated nations against the foreign yoke of Greece. Thomas had raised the lower strata of populations, such as the Arabs, the Slavs of the Balkan peninsula, the races of the Caucasus and the Armenians, in rebellion against the empire. On the plea of hereditary right, since he professed to be that Constantine whom Irene had blinded, he persuaded the patriarch of Antioch to

Crete by the Arabs in 823, the revolt of the Dalmatian towns from Byzantium, and the progress of the Saracen conquest of Sicily, indicate the critical state of the Byzantine empire under his rule.

Michael's moderation in the image controversy led the head of the ecclesiastical party of independence, the **Fiery Abbot** abbot Theodorus of Studion (752-826), to entertain various hopes, the frustration of which drove that fiery spirit into violent antagonism. An uncompromising enemy of Cæsaro-papism, who did not endure that "our word should be hidden for one single



THE COUNCIL OF NICAËA IN THE YEAR 787, WHICH ESTABLISHED IMAGE-WORSHIP

The great religious controversy of the eighth century was over the worship of images. The Emperor Leo III. was a great Iconoclast, but his vigorous efforts to suppress the superstitious veneration of images were without permanent success, as the Council of Nicaea in 787, under Constantine, son of Leo IV., forty-seven years after the great Leo's death, re-established the worship of images. From a miniature in a Greek Testament of the ninth century.

crown him; and relying on a large army and a powerful fleet, this "pupil of the old devil," as Michael styled him, was only defeated by the emperor with the aid of the Bulgarian prince Omortag, in the vicinity of the capital. The terrible shock which this revolt caused to the Byzantine empire appears clearly from a letter sent by Michael in 824 to the emperor Louis the Pious, accompanied with costly presents, green and yellow silks, Tyrian purple, crimson and blue stuffs.

The emperor Michael showed himself by no means capable where Bulgarian help was not forthcoming. The capture of

hour," and paid no regard to ecclesiastical superiors or synods, he had already claimed the supremacy of the law and the Gospel over the emperor, and had argued that the emperor was not mentioned in the Gospels. He now pointed to the government of the Church, which had to decide the divine dogmas, while the emperor and princes had to help them and ratify the decisions.

The antagonism of this talented and firm prelate would have been far more damaging to the Byzantine monarchy had not Greek national pride been aggrieved by the constant stress laid on the primacy of Rome—which was to Theodorus the safe harbour of refuge for the whole Church

in every storm of heresy; in fact, he smoothed the path for Photius, the leader of the Greek party of independence. Theodorus extols the peaceful monastic world in a biography of the abbot Plato, and by epigrams, in which every useful member of the community, from sick-nurse to abbot, is glorified as an emblem

Revival

of

Iconoclasm

of duty faithfully fulfilled; his addresses contain golden grains of sincerest philanthropy. From them, as from the biography of his mother Theoctiste, and from his letters—"I shall never grow weary of writing," he says, in the last letter of the collection—breathes a full and rich humanity and an inflexible power of resistance which could not be broken by thrice-inflicted imprisonment and scourging. But his lofty conceptions of Church and State ran counter to the stream of Greek development. The monastery of Theodorus remained the seat of varied intellectual labours; and from it the perfected system of minuscules was carried out, as the Tetra-Evangelium of Porphyrius Uspensky, dating from the year 835, attests.

Iconoclasm on the lines of Constantine V. was continued under Michael's son Theophilus (829-842), who wished to ensure the victory of his school by the unsparing infliction of imprisonment and branding. At the beauty contest before the nuptials of Theophilus, who wished to award the apple to the fairest, Casia, a maiden who pleased him particularly, retorted to his remark, "Sorrow came into the world through woman," with the answer, "Yet woman is the source of happiness."

For this she was passed over by Theophilus. She founded a convent, where her poetic gifts were developed. Discarding the old poetic forms, and trusting to the popular style, she ventured to write verse whose rhythm depends not on quantity, like the classical Greek and Latin, but on stress, as in English poetry.

A Noble

Poetess of

Byzantium

Reminiscences of Menander and echoes of the Bible could not deprive her of her own feelings; a self-conscious originality flashes forth in her songs of hatred, "I hate him who adapts himself to every custom." We can believe that frivolity and laziness roused to indignation this defiant spirit, and that a laborious life among learned men had more attractions for it than a pleasant existence in the society of fools. Theophilus was consistently

pursued by ill-fortune. The Saracenic advance was checked in Asia Minor by a Persian prince, called, as a Christian, Theophobus; an inroad was even made into the Arabian empire. But to balance this came the terrible pillage of the town of Amorion after a siege from the 7th to the 15th of August, 838, by the caliph Mutasim, or Motassim (833-842). The martyrdom of the forty-two Greeks of Amorion was deeply graven on the memory of the Greeks. In the west, Palermo fell into the hands of the Arabs.


The belief in images still flourished in spite of violent measures; the three eastern patriarchs repeated in a letter of 839 to Theophilus the story of the impression of the face of Mary on a pillar at Lydda. Theophilus, whose panegyrists extol his exertions in the cause of science—for instance, by conceding to scholars the permission to teach—and for the safety and buildings of the capital, rewarded his greatest general, his brother-in-law, Theophobus, with base ingratitude, and his last act as monarch was to order the execution of this meritorious servant and kinsman. The regency for the thirteen-year-old

Image son of Theophilus, Michael III.
Worship (842-867), was undertaken by
Restored his mother Theodora, his uncle Burdas, a strong and unscrupulous character, and the Magister Manuel.

The connection of the latter with the monks of the celebrated monastery of Studion seems to explain the order which was given for the restoration of image worship. The synod of 843, the anniversary of which the Greek Church celebrates, ended the long controversy.

All the symptoms of madness appeared in the young emperor; passion for the circus and for low company, infatuated extravagance, drunkenness, unrestrained lust, and mischievous cruelty. That malicious delight in turning to ridicule what was sacred to other men—by desecrating the Sacrament and arranging processions of his boon companions attired in episcopal vestments—sprang with Michael from that same mania for outrage which prompted the emperor Caligula to erect his statue in the Temple at Jerusalem. He is to be compared with Caligula rather than with Nero, although the latter is the parallel preferred by the Byzantine historians.

As a terrible warning of the dangers which threatened a weak Byzantium from the north, the Russians appeared



THE EMPEROR THEOPHILUS OF BYZANTIUM CHOOSES HIS WIFE

"With a golden apple in his hand, he slowly walked down the line of contending beauties; his eye was detained by the charms of Casia, and, in the awkwardness of a first declaration, the emperor could only observe that 'In this world, women had been the cause of much evil.' And surely, sir, she pearly replied, 'they have likewise been the cause of much good.' This affection of unreasonable wit displeased the Imperial lover. He turned aside in disgust; Casia concealed her disappointment in a convent, and the modest silence of Theodora was rewarded with the Golden apple. — 1480." From the painting by Val Prinsep, R.A.

before Constantinople on July 15, 860, according to the anonymous chronicler of Brussels. These Scandinavian hordes—not Slavs from the Baltic or Goths from the Crimea—had won great fame early in the ninth century. They themselves bore northern names and gave Scandinavian names to the falls of the Dnieper, which

they descended in their boats. **Northern Heroes Rule the Slavs** Even the treaties of the Russians with Byzantium in 907, 911, 945 and 971 show precisely the same northern military oath as the treaty of Charles the Bald with Regner, in 845, and of Siegfred and Halfdan with Lewis the German. Otherwise the traces of northern names and designations are scanty enough. In the name of the town which in Slavonic is called Turow is concealed the name Tury, which came to Russia with Rogvolod = Rag(e)vald; otherwise the Ivor Street in Novgorod and the spot in Kiev where the god Thor was worshipped are, with the "knout," almost the only memorials of the northern home from which the invaders came.

These northern heroes had been called into the country by the Slavs, Tchades, Kriviches, and Wesses as the superior national power. "Our country is large and rich, but there is no order in it; do you come and rule and govern over us," said the Slavs, according to Nestor's chronicle. But the Russians appeared savage and boorish, the "most blood-stained" people, to the Byzantines, who, mistrusting their own strength, ascribed the retreat of the Russians to the dipping of the robe of the Mother of God in the waves of the Bosphorus, as Photius relates, and claimed the credit for the subsequent conversion of the Russians to Christianity.

The Russians then made Novgorod and Kiev centres of the empire, and retained their Scandinavian character for a long time in the former city; in the latter, notwithstanding northern followers (Druschina),

they became Slavonic by the year 1000; but in reality **Russia Gets Christianity From Byzantium** they accepted Christianity under Byzantine influence

and drew their learning and culture from Byzantium—although not until far later; the peace of 907 was still sworn to by the god Perun, in whom we detect features of the Scandinavian Thor, and Volus, who is certainly not Basilus. Olga, Igor's wife, was the first to receive baptism, and the entire nation became Christian under Vladimir

(980-1015). A section of the crews in the fleet, and later a company of the imperial body-guard, celebrated for their weapons—axe and pike combined—were formed out of the Russians; the Varagi, or with Slav nasal, Varangi, Varengians.

Byzantium was regarded at that period, about 863, as the centre not merely of civilisation, but of Christianity; and Ratislaw of Moravia—then the country on the March, comprising a part of Lower Austria as far as the Danube, and Northern Hungary between the Danube and Gran—requested the emperor Michael III. to send him a missionary familiar with Slavonic, and in this way endeavoured to obtain a Slavonic liturgy and a Church of Græco-Slavonic constitution. Through the brothers Constantine and Methodius of Thessalonica not merely did the Slavonic dialect of that region (in Moravia slightly blended with German words) become the prevailing dialect for ecclesiastical purposes, but in other respects we can see there the beginning of that complex civilisation which we may term Slavo-Byzantine. Eastern elements are prominent in this civilisation, as might be expected from its

Byzantine origin; but among **The Slavo-Byzantine Civilisation** the Slavs, owing to the manner of its transmission, it has been everywhere influenced by the national Church. We have not yet surveyed the extent of the Slavonic debt to Byzantinism. Institutions and forms of government, law and plastic arts, religious conceptions and liturgy, legends and myths—all flowed in narrow but numerous channels down to the Slavonic nations. And there the differentia of the races down to the present day has been not Teutonism and Slavonism, but Teutonism and Byzantinised Slavonism.

We derive our information about the life of the brothers Constantine and Methodius from their biography, the so-called "Pannonian Legends." They were born at Thessalonica as Greeks, certainly not of a mixed race, in the midst of Slavonic tribes, with whose tongues they became at an early age familiar, so that Methodius actually administered a Slavonic principality in Thessaly, before he retired to Olympus in Asia Minor. Constantine had close relations in Byzantium with Photius, who in 855-856, was sent with him to the Arabs, and went (860-861) as missionary to the Khazars; he then, at the request of Ratislaw in

THE DAYS OF THE IMAGE-BREAKERS

863, accompanied Methodius to Moravia, and certainly took with him some portions of the Old Testament already translated into Slavonic. The heretical attitude of

Photius forced the brothers to break with Byzantium and turn to Rome, where Pope Hadrian II. consecrated them bishops in 868; the Slavonic liturgy was at first sanctioned there—by Pope Hadrian II., in 869, and Pope John VIII. in 880—although it was afterwards prohibited in the "Commonitorium" of Pope Stephen VI. and in his letter to Svatopluk (discovered in the monastery of the Holy Cross). Constantine, or as he was now called, Cyril, died in 869; Methodius laboured on the shores of the lake of Platten, extended his influence to Croatia, and died in Moravia in 885.

The struggle about the Slavonic liturgy was carried on with much heat by the clergy; the victory of the liturgy, in spite of the

restrictions imposed by Pope Stephen VI., enabled the Slavs to outstrip the Germanic nations in the work of organising a national church. We may see here the effect of the spirit of independence characteristic of the Byzantine Church. The Slavonic national (glagolitic) alphabet, invented by Cyril and closely modelled on the Greek

cursive character facilitated the establishment of Christianity among the Slavs. The sphere of glagolitic monuments extends from Moravia and Bohemia to Croatia, Istria

and Dalmatia. Subsequently we find a simplified form of the Cyrillian alphabet which was probably composed by Bishop Clement of Drenovica under the Tsar

Symeon on the model of Greek uncials. It was certainly not directly through Methodius and the picture of the Last Judgment ascribed to the Slavonic apostle—by an erroneous identification with a painter—but indirectly through the whole Christianising movement and the influence of Byzantium, that the conversion of Boris, prince of the Bulgarians and of the Bulgarian people, came about. The Bulgarians, standing on a low plane of civilisation, retained their barbarous habits and were profoundly superstitious. The Oriental turban was

worn by the men, while close-fitting dresses, long sashes ornamented with gold and silver buttons, and veils for the face were still retained by the women.

They employed oxen and sheep as mediums of exchange; slaves worked for them in an oppressive serfdom, or were even sold to Byzantium. Wonder-working stones were hung round the necks of the sick, and the dead man was given his slaves and wives to accompany him to the grave. A deep gulf separated ruler and subjects, of whom even the foremost did not

eat at the same table with the prince. The core of the nation was represented by the greater and inferior nobility.

Boris had clearly seen how necessary



BYZANTINE COSTUMES OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY



BYZANTINE SOLDIERS OF THE NINTH CENTURY

From an illustration in a rare Byzantine manuscript in the Paris National Library

it was for his kingdom of Bulgaria to receive Christianity, which he had himself adopted, with an imperial sponsor, under the name of Michael. The question whether to join Rome or Byzantium was more obscure. The persecutions of the pagans, which he himself initiated, and the inrush of eager missionaries of the most

Persecutions of the Pagans various sects (for example, of the Paulicians) into this new domain of Christianity—of lay Christians who professed to be priests and mixed all the superstition of their own homes with Christianity, or of Jews who wished to disseminate their creed—did not conduce to make the new doctrines more popular. To crown all came the teaching of the highest ecclesiastical party of Byzantium, of the patriarch Photius, which must have driven the Bulgarian prince out of his senses; he received a sketch of the essential nature and features of orthodoxy, a theological treatise on the Trinity, and a history of the seven œcumenical synods and their most influential personalities, all of which he must have found hopelessly unintelligible. This much was clear to him, however, that his people, or at any rate he in his own person, should take a leap from their primitive manners to the ideal of the Byzantine court, where no one was allowed to talk too fast, laugh too loud, or speak unbecomingly.

The Bulgarian prince therefore experimented with Rome. Pope Nicholas I., cleverly recognising the needs of a simple race, conceded the Bulgarian's requests, some of which were truly marvellous. The grasp which Rome possessed of the Bulgarian situation, the care with which her representatives suggested a higher civilisation, were in striking contrast to the ostentatious erudition of Byzantine theologians, and to the Byzantine insistence upon tedious ceremonies. But the advantage of Rome was thrown away, owing to quarrels of

a personal kind. The Pope refused to approve the bishop who was presented to him, and the alliance was broken off.

The discourteous attitude of Rome towards the Greek envoys in Bulgaria, who were simply driven out of the country, and the rejection of the message communicated by them, supplied Photius, who, patriarch of Constantinople since 858, had been deposed at a Roman synod in 863, with the final motive for a rupture with Rome. The theological basis of the renunciation of Rome, the encyclical of 867, so important in the history of the world, was not weighty or burdensome. In the West, men had taught that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son, and by so doing had, according to the view of Photius, denied the monarchical constitution of the Trinity. In conformity with the western view the creed had been altered by the admission of the words "and from the Son," against

Primacy Transferred to Byzantium which the confessions of faith engraved by Pope Leo III. on silver plates bore witness. Further, in order most thoroughly to shatter Rome's claim to supremacy, Photius asserted the transference of the primacy to Byzantium, by the removal of the imperial residence from Rome to New Rome. But undoubtedly the weightiest reason was the rejection in the West of so many Church customs which were knit up with the Greek

national life. Photius then revealed the deep rift between East and West; it was national, and only brought into relief by the Church dispute. Meanwhile the secular power had passed to the Macedonian ex-groom and friend of Michael, the joint-emperor Basilus, who put Michael to death,

and founded the "Macedonian" dynasty. Now first, long after the loss of the eastern provinces, the Greek spirit had vigorously roused itself and produced among the people the consciousness of national unity.



AQUEDUCT OF THE GREEK EMPERORS, NEAR PYRGO



BYZANTIUM AT ITS ZENITH AND THE BEGINNING OF THE EMPIRE'S DECLINE

THE intercourse with the east and the former incorporation of Oriental provinces in the empire, with their great influence on culture, left traces for centuries; eastern suggestions, Armenian colonists, and natives of Asia Minor played a great part at court and in the state. But the Greek elements had begun to combine; and here too the first attempt at national union found expression in the Church. Learning and education, law and literature, had seen a renaissance of the old Byzantine and Greek life, and the whole state became emphatically an expression of Greek intellect.

The divinely appointed rule of the emperor, despotic and unrestrained by law, in things spiritual and secular alike, swayed the Byzantine intellect. The spiritual and secular dignitaries were nominated by him, and a shadowy senate was summoned. The imperial finance minister, the keeper of the privy purse, the commandant of the watch and the postmaster-general, the other great dignitaries known as patricians, and the "protospathariti," the private secretary, the captain of the city, and the quæstor (then probably head of the police) flocked round the throne and executed the commands in the various administrative and legislative spheres.

The high military officers ruled the provinces, and played an important rôle at court. They were excellently paid, as also were the subordinate officers, if we consider that everything was found for them. The army itself was devoted to its leaders, received small pay, but complete board, lodging, and clothing, and was in other respects treated considerably. This is attested not merely by their exemption from taxation, and by the splendid baths at Dorylæum, which could hold seven thousand men; the reputation they enjoyed in the wars with the

Arabs as the avengers and saviours of Christianity, and the demand that all fallen soldiers should be declared martyrs, furnish an eloquent proof of it. There was also a powerful clergy, who had immense monastic estates as well as poor monasteries at their disposal, and ruled the people politically also by using religious controversy for political opposition and urging the masses to fight through enthusiasm for the cause. From the clergy also came to a large extent the "cloud of humanists, who made verses and turned phrases, who begged and were not ashamed." They found an appreciative audience in the large class of wealthy men who bought titles, and even salaried offices as a life annuity.

Then came the bourgeois class, from which were sometimes recruited the ranks of the clergy through the desire for seclusion, sometimes those of the lower officials of court and civil service, by the sale of offices, or the posts once bought became hereditary in the families of the order. The artisan guilds protected the old church customs as unassailable achievements of faith.

Then came the peasantry, diminished by the attractive power of the monasteries and by the sale of the land, and also ruined by a defective system of credit. All round the capital, in the district called the Province of the Walls, large estates had been formed, on which peasant serfs worked for the emperor, for patricians and monasteries—a picture of the whole empire. The peasant, once perhaps free, who worked on these estates could not be evicted, but also did not possess the right of emigration, and he paid protection-money and blood tithes far more than the former tithe of corn; he was indeed a serf. The diminution of the free peasant class became noticeable from the increase

**Power and
Riches of
the Clergy**

**Emperor
by Right
Divine**

**Peasantry
in
Serfdom**

in the mercenary forces, as in the Athens of the fourth century.

Thus, this prosperous season of the Byzantine empire is naturally characterised by a constant struggle for the protection, maintenance, and increase of the free peasantry. A powerful effort in this direction was made by the Homestead

Struggle for a Free Peasantry

Act of the emperor Romanus Lacapenus, who in 934 passed a law forbidding the magnates to acquire any villages or hamlets from the poor; they had actually to give back any purchases of land, except in the case of their having raised valuable buildings. As magnates were reckoned higher officials and place-holders, members of the superior clergy, and all who had money and position. The old connection between landed property and military service appears further in the resuscitated institution of inalienable military fiefs, the owners of which had to provide equipment and food; and only the heirs, and those who bore a share of military service and taxation, might acquire such property.

The artisan class was superstitious, dull-witted, and, notwithstanding Christianity, addicted to the old cults. The lowest section finally was represented by the very numerous slaves, in whom a flourishing trade was carried on. Danilis, the richest lady of the Peloponnesus, presented to her imperial adopted son Basilus 500 slaves (including 100 eunuchs), and 100 slave girls; after her death, in 888, the emperor emancipated 3,000 of her slaves and settled them in Lower Italy.

The strength of the Byzantine empire lay in the army and fleet. Mercenaries and newly settled subjects occupied a large place among the tenants of military fiefs. The imperial fleet, under the Drungarius, was paid from the state coffers; the provincial fleet by the Themata provinces; the majority of the ships belonged to the imperial fleet. Tubes for discharging Greek fire were

Byzantium's Naval Equipment

placed on the bows of the dromonds. The fleet was manned by Russian Northmen,

who served as mercenaries, at one time also by Syrian Mardaites, as barbarians who had settled in the empire and were liable to service, and finally by the native population of the island province, of the province of Samos, and of the Cibyrrhæotic province. When this latter territory was lost the navy also was ruined, so that in

the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century pirates swept the seas. When the necessity of a navy made itself felt in the war with the Norman fleet, the Venetians fought and decided the battles of the Greek emperor.

The core of the Byzantine empire was Asia Minor, which required to be defended by perpetual war against the Arabs. On the Black Sea it still possessed the Crimea, the starting point for the trade with the surrounding nations, especially with the Khazars. The Pechenegs and Bulgarians enclosed the small part of Thrace and Macedonia which still remained Greek. The Peloponnese, through the attitude of the Slavonic tribes, was only in parts nominally dependent. Dyrrhachium served to secure the communications with Italy. By the side of the independent kingdom of Italy, with Pavia as its capital, Calabria still maintained its position as a Greek province; an attempt was also made by Byzantium to exercise some maritime supervision in these waters. In Sicily, on the contrary, there were but few points still in Byzantine hands. Basilus I. (867-886) laid the founda-

Basilus I. on the Throne

tions for the internal and external consolidation of the empire. He was descended from an Armenian family of military colonists at Adrianople; his mother was called Pankalo and was, according to Tabari, a Slav. In compensation for Sicily, which soon became completely Arab, and where only the Byzantine law prevailed, he added to Calabria a second province of Southern Italy, Longibardia. Considering the actual secession of Venice, which had created for herself an invincible position on the sea by the treaty of 840 with Lothaire, and its ratification by Lewis II. in 857, it was a master stroke of diplomatic self-control on the part of Basilus I. to regain at any rate a formal recognition of his suzerainty from Venice by sending an embassy, transmitting presents, and conferring on the Doge, Ursus Partiacus, in 879 the title of Protospatharius.

Buildings shot up in numbers—according to report more than 100 churches and palaces. The emperor Basilus was so amicably disposed towards Rome that the learned and indefatigable Patriarch, Photius, who in 867 had deposed Pope Nicholas I. at a so-called council, was at the eighth œcumenical synod at Jerusalem

BYZANTIUM AT ITS ZENITH

declared to have forfeited his office and was replaced by the patriarch Ignatius. The thought that one single faith ought to govern Christians induced the prelates of the east, who were under the emperor's influence, to sign a formula of submission to Rome.

A fitting pendant to this ecclesiastical policy was the suppression of the Paulicians by Basilus; they removed under Tzimisces to the Balkan peninsula and were revived in the sect of the Bogumiles. Perhaps also the persecution of the Jews in Southern Italy by Basilus may be traced to a renewal of the claim of Leo the Isaurian to establish one faith throughout the empire. Glancing over the domain of art we might regard the decorations of the church of Scripu, built in 873-874, as an instructive allegory of the spiritual movement of that time; an abundance of designs attests the presence of a strong vitality, but is still, it must be confessed, crude in execution, an echo of the hard struggles of the Byzantine people from which the old language, altered in many ways, emerged victoriously. The hereditary monarchy, which extended from 867 to 1028, was unusually emphasised in form by the joint sovereignty of the sons—in the case of Basilus I., Leo VI. and Alexander; in the case of Romanus II., Basilus II. and Constantine VIII.—but, in fact, it broke down through the institution of mayors of the palace.

The learned emperor Leo VI. (the Wise, 886-911), who was compared to the emperor Claudius, had a far higher importance than the "wise fool" of the Julian line, whose studies exercised no sort of influence upon his time. It may be that merely utilitarian considerations led the Byzantines of this age to collect all the learning of the past, and, above all, that of Justinian's epoch, but, at any rate, they completely resuscitated it. The process of decay, uninterrupted since Heraclius, seemed checked for the future;

even in the descriptions of the provinces which the emperor Constantine VII. Porphyrogennetus supplied the sixth century is the authoritative basis, notwithstanding the new organisation by Leo VI. The great code of the Basilica in sixty books, compiled between 887 and 893, was one such renewal. Basilus in his

Justinian's Code Revived "Procheirus" had restored this basis as much as possible, and now the entire code of Justinian was revived, not merely as regarded the marriage law, divorce, and the limitation of marriage contracts to the wealthy, but also in matters of family law, the authority of the father, the law of compulsory inheritance, and usury.

But in a still more significant fashion Leo recurred to the glorious age of Justinian. Cæsaropapism arose afresh; ordinances were issued as to the admissibility of married aspirants to bishoprics, and the

age limits of subdeacons; festivals were appointed for celebrated preachers, marriage dispensations were granted. A patriarch who opposed his wishes, Nicholas, a friend of his youth, whom he had honoured with the title of

a trusted councillor, was compelled by the emperor to hand in his resignation, as he refused to bless the emperor's fourth marriage, and even excommunicated him in 907.

It was then quite obvious that the emperor settled the rank and the precedence of the prelates. The dioceses formerly subordinated to Rome were now recovered—Nicomedia, Stellas, Sicily, Stygmon, Cephallenia, Thessalonica, Dyrrhachium, Dalmatia were finally separated from Rome and made subject to Byzantium. Conformably to this change, these countries were regarded as new provinces, and, as such, enrolled in the new list of Themata. Even then the generalisation of Constantine Porphyrogennetus, that the empire was split up into governorships, and that the emperor had not, therefore, his old power, might hold good for the emperors, with the



BYZANTINE SEWED WORK, 1,000 YEARS OLD
A piece of richly decorated sewed work from the state robe of the emperor Romanus Lacapenus, bearing his name and that of his son.

**Leo the Wise
Rules over
Byzantium**

whose studies exercised no sort of influence upon his time. It may be that merely utilitarian considerations led the Byzantines of this age to collect all the learning of the past, and, above all, that of Justinian's epoch, but, at any rate, they completely resuscitated it. The process of decay, uninterrupted since Heraclius, seemed checked for the future;

exception of the greatest. Wealthy families, especially on the frontiers of the empire, collected followers, transformed the peasants into soldiers, and founded Byzantine feudalism.

Theological interests drew Leo into church meetings as an official orator; scholastic attainments led him to imitate Latin verse in a macaronic vein. Much certainly has been fathered upon him which he did not compose, but brought on him his bad reputation. On the other hand, when we consider the great attraction of the successes of his father, Basilius, and his commander-in-chief Nicephorus Phocas, as well as the reference to the capture of Theodosiopolis, and the predominant position of the Arabs, it is almost certain that Leo is really the author of the "Tactics." Leo employed pagan Magyars as "executioners" against the Christian Bulgarians, but hardly with success; the Tsar Symeon was justified in reproaching him with this violation of Christian fellow-feeling.

A commercial question, that of burdening the trade between Greece and Bulgaria with heavy tolls and of diverting it from Constantinople, induced Symeon (893-927) to wage war on Byzantium. The appointment of a Bulgarian patriarch in Achrida—which from this time down to 1767 was the intellectual centre of the Western Balkan countries—and the assumption of the imperial title Tsar (Cæsar), over the Bulgarians in 917, and the Greeks in 924, clearly revealed his plans. He told the emperor: "This is an empire which has come to me!" In his opinion the Bulgarians usually coveted the land of others; the Greeks ceded their own.

Symeon, who before his accession had lived in a monastery, to which his uncles also withdrew, wished to elevate his people by the introduction of Greek learning; he had himself read Demosthenes and Aristotle at Byzantium in his youth. He projected a reference book, which comprised treatises on theological, philosophical, and historical subjects, and was translated into Russian in the eleventh century, and he caused an epitome of the Greek law to be prepared. Grigori then translated Malalas; his cousin, Todor Dutsov, copied manuscripts in his monastery; John the Exarch described in his preface to the Hexameron the residence

of the tsar, in which the splendour of Byzantine architecture and painting, and the glittering gold of the robes of the princes and nobles, contrasted so sharply with the cottages of the country. Fresh strength and a recently-adopted culture had here to be overcome. The Turkish and new Slavonised people of the Bulgarians thus formed at that age of international consolidation the very heart of Slavonism and became its champions in virtue of their military and political capabilities.

The Magyars seemed to Leo the most suitable allies against Symeon. The race is in its germ Finno-Ugrian, since its numerals and words for ordinary objects of life are identical with those of the Finnish-Ugrian Vogules. From their far distant home on the Isim, Irtish, and Om, where Aristæas of Proconnesus, the authority of Herodotus, describes the forefathers of the Magyars, the Iyrkes, on their hunting expeditions, the Magyars had come in the course of nearly 1,500 years into the country between the Caspian and the Black Seas, and into the region between Kuban and Don, where fishing might be combined with the chase. They had then settled, about 860, in Livadia, between the Don and the Dnieper, where they fell under the influence of the Khazars and adopted numerous Turkish words. The Khazars, who adopted Judaism soon after 860, then ruled over an empire which stretched from the Jaik to the Dnieper and Bug, from the Caspian Sea and the southern slopes of the Caucasus to the Middle Volga and the Oka. The Magyars, pressing on further, came to the country of Atelkuzu, where they ruled the Slavs and sold them into slavery, but also came under Slavonic influence, which affected their customs and language.

In the war with the Bulgarians the Magyars were at first successful; but on the way home they suffered a disastrous defeat and were now attacked by the Pechenegs, or Patzinaks, on the Dnieper, whom the Bulgarians launched at them, thus imitating the Byzantine system. Their families, which remained behind on the steppes of Bessarabia, were crushed or captured; the whole nation thereupon decided in 896-897, under the rule of Arpad (890-907), to march further to the west, and so immigrated into their present home, separated into North and South

Leo's Keen Interest in Theology

Magyars Set Against the Slavs

An Emperor Taken From a Monastery

Slavs, and made great expeditions through Europe. With this event concludes the second national migration. Old native sources were first worked up in the thirteenth century into the untrustworthy "Gesta Hungarorum" of the anonymous notary of King Bela IV., so that the passages in Leo's "Tactica" and Constantine Porphyrogenetus are more valuable.

The terrible sacking of Thessalonica by the renegade Leo—from the Syrian Tripolis, 904—showed that the navy was still unable to fulfil its duties of guarding the seas. The lamentations of the patriarch Nicholas, with which the church of St. Sophia resounded, testified to the weakness of the empire. It is interesting to note that, in spite of these Arabian plundering expeditions, fairly good relations were maintained with the Arabs at Constantinople, who, according to the testimony of that patriarch, were allowed to possess a mosque and to profess their religion without let or hindrance.

The foolish provocation given to Symeon by Leo's successor, Alexander (912-913), who insulted his envoys, renewed the war

Rise of the Bulgarian Power between Symeon and Byzantium; the latter was besieged in 913. The new Great Bulgaria now comprised the Balkan peninsula from Mesembria to Rhodope, from Olympus to the mouth of the Calama with the exception of the strip of Macedonia on the sea, towards Servia as far as the united Drin, the White Drim, the Ibar, and the Save. Wallachia, parts of Hungary, and Transylvania, completed the immense empire.

Constantine VII. Porphyrogenetus ("Born in the Purple"), 912-959, early turned his attention to learned studies. His restoration of the old university went hand in hand with an eager revival of the old learning in the domains of history, geography, agriculture, natural history and medicine. At that period the taste for collecting literary treasures was widely prevalent, as is shown by other collections—for example, that of old epigrams by Constantine Cephalus—which Constantine had not initiated; but his influence did much to mould the characteristics of this "encyclopaedic age." The connoisseurs of antiques—such as Basilus of Neocæsareum—dedicated their works to him. He had the consciousness, in spite of all the learning of past ages,

that the language could not be cramped and stationary, but that it ought to develop continuously and in keeping with the present. He showed the same taste for history as his grandfather, Basilus I., and continued the work of Theophanes, but in an inflated and boastful style. In his age the Byzantine system of mayors

Encyclopaedic Age of Byzantium of the palace was developed. It is beyond any doubt that we may thus designate the position of the Basileiopatōrs, who ultimately bore the imperial title Stylianus Zautzes, as in 894. The fact that in the Frankish empire the post of the mayor of the palace grew out of the royal civil service, which was concerned with the administrative duties of the royal household, and in Byzantium out of the post of commander of the foreign guard, cannot establish convincingly any difference between the mayor of the palace and the Basileiopatōr. More distinctive is the fact that the Carolingians only rose to be viceroys, but the Byzantine commanders to real imperial dignity by the side of the Armenian dynasty; in fact, the latter formally took the second place.

Romanus I. Lacapenus (919-944 co-emperor), the son-in-law of Constantine, reduced the latter not merely to the second, but, by the coronation of his own three sons, actually to the fifth place; and, unlike the Carolingian mayors, abandoned even the outward semblance of respect for the ruling dynasty. In Bulgaria, after the conclusion of peace in 924, and after the death of Symeon in 927, the recognition of the Bulgarian patriarchate and the marriage of Maria, grand-daughter of Romanus, with the Tsar Peter, produced friendly relations with Byzantium. The solidarity of Islam was broken up by an alliance with the emir of Melitene in 928. Armenia, which was bound to East Rome by so many private ties, and had become a great power under Asot (915-928), was now brought into a political alliance; and amity was established with the Russians after their severe defeats by the commercial treaty of 945.

The glory of acquiring new relics, especially that of the image of Christ, which had been brought from Edessa to Rome, cast a halo round the usurped crown of Romanus; the latter knew also how to employ the Curia for his own purposes; he won its friendship, ostensibly

by a "union" in 920, and really by the enthronement of Theophylactus, his horse-loving son, as patriarch. It is hard to say how far Romanus may have entered into financial negotiations with the senator Alberic, the protector of the Curia, for the transference of imperial rights. Finally, Constantine VII., by the agency of the sons of Romanus, freed himself from the father, and then from the sons themselves.

Even if little that is complimentary can be said about the talents of Constantine as a ruler, as a man he stands far above his son Romanus II. (959-963), who at the age of nineteen had married Theophano, the beautiful daughter of a poor innkeeper. Joseph Bringas, the moving spirit of the government, confided the war against Crete to the experienced Nicephorus Phocas, who conquered the island in 961 and brought it back to Christianity. He had already captured the Cilician towns and Aleppo, when the news arrived of the death of Romanus II. Theophano was to act as regent for his infant children, Basilus II. and Constantine VIII.


Nicephorus thereupon marched to the capital and had himself crowned emperor, not without the co-operation of a bastard son of Romanus Lacapenus, Basilus, the president of the senate.

Nicephorus II. (963-969) was a silent ascetic with a fiery soul, who practised the virtue of self-suppression not only through the privations of a soldier's life but also in the monastic cell; rude, rough, and ugly, but surrounded by all the charm of victorious campaigns, the idol of his troops, he became the husband of the most seductive and most delicate of women, the empress-widow Theophano, who thus secured for herself the successful general. He carried on the crusade against Islam with the fanaticism which is peculiar to the Cappadocian race from which he sprang; the fallen were to be reckoned martyrs. Everything must be subservient to the purposes of the war, of the army, and of the navy, which Byzantium alone possessed, as the emperor boasted to

Liutprand. The coinage was debased as a means of relieving the finances; restrictions upon the acquisition of land in mortmain, perhaps also a limitation of the right of pre-emption to individuals of the same status as the vendor, were tried as a means of restoring solvency.

The wide stretch of frontier facing the Arabs had become with its fortresses a military frontier, which urgently needed settlers. Patience was required; the Jacobitic immigrants were, according to the emperor's word, to remain exempt from all annoyance on the score of dogma. The emperor had, it is true, made more promises than the clergy of Byzantium wished to keep; in spite of everything the Syrians were dragged into the capital for religious tests. No monk ever formed so rigid an ideal as this emperor, who would have wished to lay all the riches of the world at the feet of Theophano, but had himself absolutely no wants. The home for which he sighed was Laura on Mount Athos, founded by Athanasius in 968 at his instigation; there retirement from the world was possible in the strictest form, in the spirit of the old Oriental monasticism, in the spirit of Abbot Theodorus of Studion.

As a part of official salaries was kept back by Nicephorus, as Cæsaro-papism threatened to revive in its harshest form through his policy, since without the emperor's consent and command no episcopal election could be held, and no See occupied, and as an almost extortionate advantage of the corn monopoly was taken by the government, the whole empire was in ferment. Theophano took measures to ensure that a palace revolution under the young Armenian John Tzimiscēs should find the bedroom of her husband open; and Nicephorus was put out of the way. The empress Theophano was banished by the patriarch. John Tzimiscēs was compelled to devote half of his entire fortune to the impoverished peasantry in the metropolitan thema, by the enlargement and furnishing of a great hospital in Constantinople. On this condition he was



CROWN OF THE BYZANTINE EMPERORS
This is a reconstruction of the style of crown used by the emperors of Byzantium. It was most richly worked in gold and precious stones and decorated in cloisonné enamel.

The Throne Falls to an Armenian

BYZANTIUM AT ITS ZENITH

recognised as emperor, and was crowned in 969 in the church of Saint Sophia. Tzimiskes conducted the war against Russia with brilliant success, since he liberated Bulgaria. But he did not restore the empire to the Tsar Boris II., who was released from captivity; Bulgaria remained henceforth under Byzantine rule. Only a small piece of Macedonia and Albania had passed in the year 963 under the rule of the Sismanids, and now remained independent. Tzimiskes obtained great successes against the Arabs under the leadership of the Fatimites of Egypt; he conquered Syria and crossed

as the capital, still stood unbroken; in fact, it had been considerably extended under Samuel (976-1014). Not merely had the Byzantines received a severe defeat in 991 but even the more southerly Adriatic coast was abandoned to Bulgaria, the northern coast with the Dalmatian islands went to the Croat Kresimir I., and Serbia became a vassal state of Bulgaria. But the defeat of Samuel on the Spercheius, and still more the capture of 15,000 Bulgarians effected in 1014 on the Belasitza Mountain, south of the passes of Klidion and Kimpolung, decided

Barbarism
of a "Christian"
Emperor



THE MONASTERY OF LAURA ON MOUNT ATHOS, FOUNDED BY ATHANASIOS IN 968
During the tenth and eleventh centuries, when the religious and political unrest of Europe was so great, the monasteries attracted many notable men of Byzantium who wished to retire for a season if not for life from the turmoil of affairs.

Lebanon. The east was then thoroughly stripped of its treasured relics. He died on the march home, and there are grounds for suspecting that he was poisoned.

The kingmaker of that time, the eunuch Basilus, proclaimed Basilus II. (976-1025), then twenty years of age, as independent sovereign. The sense of the duties of a ruler completely changed his character, and moulded a youth addicted to every form of licence into a firm and almost ascetic man.

The West Bulgarian Empire under the Sismanids, with Prespa, later Achrida,

the fate of the Bulgarian Empire. The prisoners were blinded; one in every hundred was left with one eye to guide the others home. Basilus was called from this deed *Bulgaroktonos*—slayer of the Bulgarians. We can understand that the Tsar Samuel, to whom this pitiable army was sent, was heartbroken at the sight.

In the year 1018 Basilus made his entry into Achrida, where the splendid royal treasure, gold-embroidered robes, and a crown of the Sismanids set with pearls, fell into his hands. The Bulgarian nobles, who retained their privileges, could now

rejoice in Byzantine titles. The fiscal system was for the moment left unaltered. Finally independence was guaranteed to the Church of Bulgaria; its first archbishop was a Bulgarian, though it may be noticed that his successor, Leo, was a

Byzantium Triumphs over Bulgaria

Greek. Although at first the extent of the archbishopric of Achrida had been fixed at what it was in later years, the emperor, on the request of the archbishop, re-established the diocese on its old scale, as it was under Tsar Peter, notwithstanding that Greek dioceses, especially Thessalonica, were prejudiced thereby.

The high estimation in which the new subjects of the empire were held was clearly shown by the intermarriages of noble families with the royal Bulgarian house of the Sismanids. Thus Basilus was loyal to the principle which he had announced in his proclamation of 1020—"Although we have become lords of the country, we have maintained its privileges as

inviolable." Bulgaria was linked to Byzantium only by a personal union. For the acquisition of a new province, West Bulgaria with Servia, by this energetic policy of reconciliation, and for the victory of the Greek spirit over the Bulgarian, Basilus offered his thanksgiving in the church of the Mother of God at Athens, to whom costly vessels from Achrida were dedicated.

In social matters Basilus followed in the steps of Romanus I. Lacapenus, checking most stringently the formation of large landed estates. He extended the list of the magnates who were prohibited from acquiring a village or hamlet by adding to it the members of the bodyguard, abolished the right of the magnates to acquire a title by forty years' possession, and introduced a rule requiring the production of the original title-deeds. In fact, he confiscated large estates in Cilicia and Cappadocia, commanded a speculator in land to pull down his mansion, and allotted the ground among small proprietors. The whole burden of military service was, at least for some decades, put on the shoulders of the magnates and

great landed proprietors in such a way that the rich neighbours were responsible for the outstanding taxes of the small farmers.

His attack on the system of large estates was essentially a national attack, aimed by the European element in the empire at the ring of noble landed proprietors in Asia Minor. He had, perhaps, been counselled to draw the attention of the wealthy to personal anxieties and divert it from politics by heavy taxation. Basilus by unwearied exertions had acquired districts of Armenia in Asia Minor and given them back as fiefs, and had strengthened the garrisons and fortresses in every direction. The wide extent

Armenian Empire Annexed

of his acquisitions may be inferred from the new bishoprics of Keltzene. He treated the Armenian Empire, which he annexed in 1021, with the greatest leniency, so that the Armenian historian Matheus Urhaci extolled his mercy and kindness.

Under Basilus the Byzantine Empire attained not only its greatest territorial expansion, but also the zenith of domestic prosperity.

The reign of Constantine VIII. (1026-1071), in spite of his patronage of favourites, still showed the capability of repelling foreign foes, such as the Pechenegs and Arabs. His daughters, Zoë and Theodora, had some influence on the succession. An old senator, Romanus Argyropulus, was married to Zoë, and reigned as Romanus III. (1028-1034). His rôle of a crowned philosopher was ill suited to him. A remorseless persecution of the Syrian schismatics, which aroused bitterness even in the lay circles of Byzantium, drove many Syrians into the country of the Arabs. His own expedition against the Saracens ended disastrously, after he had rejected the caliph's proposals of peace. Nevertheless, the celebrated general Georgius Maniaces won Edessa.

Zoë seems to have put the emperor out of her path in favour of her paramour Michael, who, as Michael IV. (1034-1041), exercised the sovereignty in name alone; he was the brother of John, a eunuch and



BASILUS II.

He was known as "Slayer of the Bulgarians," having sent back to Tsar Samuel a captured army of 15,000 men every one of whom he had blinded, only one man in each hundred being spared one eye to lead the others home.

head of the orphanage, who became the real monarch as imperial chancellor. At any rate, the sense of the responsibilities of his great power had such effect on Michael that he was able to protect the empire against invasion. In him a zealous theologian and philosopher, who courted the society of the Theosophists, once more mounted the Byzantine throne. The Ptochiotropheion, the hall which he built in Constantinople, was a sort of refectory for the devout poor. He succeeded, with the help of large mercenary forces, in repelling the attacks of the Saracens.

The traditional recapture of Athens after a revolt against the emperor is ascribed to the northern hero Harald Hardrada, son of Sigurd; but the story springs from the erroneous interpretation of a Runic inscription on the gigantic lion in the arsenal at Venice. Thus the beautiful reflection of Athenian greatness in Icelandic ballads fades away to nothing. But it is certain that Harald fought gloriously in the years 1034 and 1035 against the Saracens on the coast of Africa and in Sicily, and against the Bulgarians on the Balkans. A yearning for his own country drove him back to

the north, even when the emperor Constantine did not wish to let him go. Danger seemed threatened by the revolt of the Slavs, whose privileges, dating from Basilius, were no longer respected. A grandson of Samuel, Peter Delaenus, was proclaimed tsar of the Bulgarians, and the Albanian population now joined them, owing to the oppressive burden of imperial taxation. But Michael crushed most remorselessly the ecclesiastical independence of Bulgaria.

The arrogance of Michael V. Calaphates (1041-1042) led to the proclamation of the princesses Theodora and Zoë as empresses; and in 1042 Zoë married Constantine IX. Monomachus (1042-1054). The rebellion of the general Maniaces, who had reconquered Sicily in 1038, was suddenly ended by an accident, most fortunate for Constantine, which cost Maniaces his life. The appointment of Greeks to Armenian bishoprics, after the incorporation of the second part of the Armenian empire, provoked the bitterest hatred of the Armenians towards Byzantium, since with this policy a confiscation of the property of the Church was evidently connected. The Armenians, or some of them at least, looked to the Seljuk Turks as their

liberators. This defection became all the more important when the Oriental Church isolated herself and completely broke away from Rome in 1054. Pope Leo IX. had indeed cherished the hope that the Greek and the German emperors, being, as it were, the two arms of the Church, would annihilate the Normans. But the title,


**The Split
in the
Church**

already acquired by the Church of Constantinople, of the "hotbed of heresy," and the contention of the patriarch Michael Cerularius that he was the true œcumenical patriarch, the sovereign over the Churches of the whole world, and that the Pope, on the contrary, was only the bishop of Rome, had made bad blood. In spite of the honest efforts of the emperor Constantine to bring about a peace, the Roman legates deposited on the altar of the church of St. Sophia a Bull of excommunication against the patriarch Cerularius; the Synod, then convened, retaliated by condemning the Bull and its author. Thus the split between the churches was made irrevocable.

At Constantinople - Monomachus then revived the old university for the study of law, philosophy, and philology. The moving spirit of this restoration was the author, Michael Psellus. Deeply influenced by the poetry and philosophy of the ancient Greeks, especially by Homer and Plato, he possessed a wonderful mastery of the Greek language. It is hardly astonishing that a supernatural knowledge was attributed to him when we consider his comprehensive and by no means drily encyclopædic mastery of the most diverse subjects. He donned the monk's dress and withdrew from the whirl of the capital and its intrigues to the Mysian Olympus. Then once again returning from the solitude, which could not appreciate his genius, into the crowded life of the court, he used his pen as a weapon, which he sold. He served under a succession of emperors,

**Last of the
Macedonian
Dynasty**

and became first minister under Michael VII. Parapinaces. After the death of Constantine IX. Theodora assumed the government, which she administered wisely with the help of the priest Leo Paraspondylos until the unconciliatory attitude of the patriarch Cerularius led her into violent opposition against the Church. The Macedonian dynasty became extinct with this empress, who transmitted the crown to the general Michael VI. Stratioticus.



THE UNDERGROUND BYZANTINE RESERVOIRS OF CONSTANTINOPLE

A most remarkable feature of Byzantine Constantinople still remaining are the strange underground reservoirs, vast in extent and splendidly constructed, used for the water supply in the time of the Byzantine empire. The upper picture shows one of these reservoirs empty of water, but the lower one, called the Basilica Cistern, is still in use.



BYZANTIUM ON THE DOWN GRADE

VICISSITUDES OF THE EMPIRE UNDER THE DYNASTY OF THE COMNENI

THE rich landowner who was chosen as successor to Michael VI., Isaac I. Comnenus (1057-1059), resisted the claims of the Oriental Church, but retired himself into the monastery of Studion and entrusted to his friend, Constantine X. Ducas (1059-1067), the heavy responsibility of the throne, for which he had no special qualifications, as the result showed. Magyars, Pechenegs, Uzes were pressing forward on every side.

The decline of Byzantine prestige was reflected in a scheme for uniting the Churches. Gagik of Armenia tore up the deed of union, delivered a successful speech on the Armenian faith which was commended by Constantine, and contrived the murder of the patriarch of Cæsarea as a heretic. Ani, the old royal city of the Armenians, then fell into the hands of the all-conquering Seljuks, and the Armenian nation was almost broken up. The empress-widow Eudocia at least

A Despairing Effort of Militarism attempted, by the choice of the general Romanus IV. Diogenes, who reigned from 1067 to 1071, to effect a military reorganisation. The neglect and delay of the last years was not to be retrieved suddenly, and an army formed with worthless soldiers. In his efforts Romanus had not only the Turks to withstand, but also the whole body of courtiers and officials, who immediately undermined his position by gibes: "He expects to check the enemy's charge with a shield and to stab him dead with a cloth-yard lance, and everyone claps his hands and shouts 'Hurrah!'"

The empire of which educated classes thus ridiculed the earnest efforts was committing suicide. The treachery of Turkish mercenaries and the incompetence and treachery of Byzantine officers, allowed the battle at Mantzikert to end so disastrously for Romanus that he was completely defeated and taken prisoner. He

was, it is true, soon released, only to fall on his return into the hands of the cruel John Ducas, who raised his nephew Michael to the purple, and put out the eyes of Romanus. The battle of Mantzikert marks the definite disruption of the possessions of the Byzantine empire in Asia Minor. In the wild competition of local pretenders for the imperial crown, fomented by mercenary officers and Turkish machinations, the latter proved the most effective factor in the founding of the sultanate of Iconium. The prosperous era of Byzantium was then dead and gone.

The feebleness of the emperor Michael VII. Ducas Parapinaces (1071-1078), who in his difficulties applied to Pope Gregory VII. in 1073 for help against the Turks, offering to renew the old union between Rome and the daughter church of Constantinople, as well as the foolish attitude of the emperor Nicephorus III. Botaniates (1078-1081) towards the Normans, complicated the position of Byzantium, which in any case was sufficiently critical after the battle of Mantzikert. The part played by the Turks on the accession of Nicephorus was significant; troops of the sultan of Iconium, who had been won over by the adherents of Michael VII., were to fight against him, but the Turkish captain of the mercenaries of Nicephorus persuaded them to retire. Both there and in other places Turks turned the scale by their troops, which they hired out to the emperor and the pseudo-emperors.

Beginnings of Turkish Aggression Alexius I. Comnenus (1081-1118) succeeded in capturing Constantinople through the treachery of a German mercenary officer Hanno. A clever diplomatist and consummate general, Alexius would have been able to confront the Turks with great force had not a new foe

arisen in the person of the Norman duke Robert Guiscard, who allied himself with Pope Gregory VII. Calabria had already fallen to the enemy, and the Balkan peninsula was the prize to which Guiscard's ambition now aspired. Robert conquered large portions of Illyria. Alexius tried by large sacrifices of money to win over the emperor Henry IV., who, indeed, only turned against Robert's ally, the Pope. Church treasures were sold, and the connection of Venetian with Byzantine interests was adroitly used in a struggle against the common foe.

The Venetians, with whom a formal treaty was concluded in May, 1082, brought their ships to replace the Byzantine fleet, which had been ruined by the loss of the provinces in Asia Minor. This treaty guaranteed to them the widest commercial rights, extending to all parts of the empire — immunity from tolls, harbour dues, and other imposts, and an independent quarter in the port of Pera. This marks the beginning of the Venetian colonial dominion in the east and of the supremacy of Byzantine culture, and above all of Byzantine art, in Venice.

In return for these trading advantages it was hoped that valuable allies had been secured for the service of the empire by Byzantium. The Venetians had to pledge themselves to fight on behalf of the possessions of their allies; in 1111 the Pisans also were pledged

to allow those of their citizens who were settled in Byzantine territory to share in defending the empire against attacks. The aggressive policy of the Normans was ended temporarily by a victory of Alexius and the death of Guiscard in 1085, when the most powerful Norman prince, Roger, adopted a policy of compromise with Byzantium.

Serious dangers threatened the Byzantine empire from the Pechenegs (1088-1091); Alexius had already sustained a defeat from them. He contrived to prevent a second reverse by buying over another Turkish race, the Cumani, who first appeared in Russia in 1055, and in 1065 expelled from Atelkuzu the Pechenegs, who had earlier ousted the Hungarians. The Cumanian language happens

to be known to us through the existence of a Cumanian glossary.

The partition of the Seljuk empire in 1092 gave Alexius some hope of driving out the Turks, not indeed alone, but with the help of the west. The letter, still extant, which the emperor addressed to Count Robert I. of Flanders may well contain many inaccuracies of translation, but in any case Alexius asked for help, and, among the many motives which impelled the Crusaders, his appeals may have been effective. In 1095 the petition of Alexius for the protection of the Holy Church was read at the



CROWNING OF ROMANUS IV. AND EUDOCIA

The empress-widow Eudocia allied herself with a general in the hope of retrieving the Byzantine fortunes by military effort, but Romanus soon suffered defeat. This ancient Byzantine carving suggests that Christ crowned the unfortunate emperor and empress.



THE BYZANTINE EMPEROR NICEPHORUS ON HIS THRONE

This dedicatory picture from an old "life" of John Chrysostom is very interesting on account of the rich, brightly embroidered costumes, and the obvious forcefulness of the portraiture. Over the head of the emperor are the words: "Nicephorus, believer in Christ the God, Emperor (autocrat) of the Romans."

Council of Piacenza; and Pope Urban II. (1088-1099) issued a proclamation on November 27th, 1095, at Clermont, for the liberation of the eastern Churches. The question of union was not then mooted—from idealistic enthusiasm on the part of Urban, and from shrewd calculation on that of Alexis.

The Norman Bohemund, son of Robert Guiscard, had at first submitted to the emperor a plan for making himself an independent sovereign, but in the end he

took the oath of fealty. After the conquest of Antioch he wished to keep this most important town in his own hands. He could do this only if he appealed for help to the authority of the papacy against the heretics of Byzantium. Urban II., however, in the councils of Bari and Rome, advocated the reconciliation of the Churches. His successor, Paschal II. (1099-1118), first attempted by his papal legate to support Bohemund, who himself came to Europe in order to make capital

out of the current prejudice against the Greeks and to divert the dangerous attacks of the Byzantine emperor on Antioch by a crusade of Europe against Byzantium. But he could not raise the mighty storm which, in his own words,

The Energy of the Comneni was necessary in order to uproot the lofty oak, although he preached from the pulpit in Chartres that the crusaders against Byzantium would obtain the richest towns, and often forced the conviction on minds irritated against the emperor that a successful crusade could begin only with the war against Byzantium. Owing to the energy of the Comneni a full century was still to elapse before these ideas were matured.

In the peace of 1107-1108, which followed on a severe defeat near Durazzo, Bohemund was forced to renew the oath of fealty for his sadly diminished principality of Antioch, which was to become again Greek—ecclesiastically so at once, and politically after Bohemund's death, in 1111. On the other hand, the promise of the subjection of the crusaders by Alexius had less importance. The severe defeat of the papacy, in 1111, induced Alexius then to offer the Pope protection and union in return for the imperial Roman crown, which offer Paschall II. declared possible under the proviso that Alexius subjected himself and abandoned his obduracy.

In 1100 the East Roman empire embraced the Balkan peninsula, including Bulgaria, as far as the Danube. Servia, Bosnia, and Croatia had been lost. The Southern Crimea was subject to Byzantium; the southern coast of the Black Sea, with Trebizond, was taken from Gregory, prince of Georgia, only in 1107, and he was enfeoffed with it in 1108. The islands of the Ægean Sea, Crete, Rhodes, and Cyprus, were Byzantine. This sovereignty was, it must be acknowledged, only nominal in many places. A rebellion caused by the pressure of taxation still surged in Crete and Cyprus; in Rhodes the pirates were the virtual rulers.

The charter of the monastery of Christodulus on Patmos, dating from April, 1088 shows how that island was a wilderness,

overgrown with thorns and treeless, without any buildings except a miserable chapel inside an ancient temple. Even this deserted rock was incessantly harassed by attacks of Turks and Christian pirates, who had driven St. Christodule from Mount Leros, in the vicinity of Halicarnassus, to Cos, and finally to Patmos. The old naval provinces of Asia Minor, from which the fleet was recruited, had fallen into the hands of the Turks as far as the Sea of Marmora. The Turk Tzachas, formerly in the Greek service, had with the title of emperor ruled from

Wonderful Cosmopolitanism of Byzantium Smyrna not merely over the surrounding country, but also over Chios, Samos, and the greater part of

Lesbos, which became once more Byzantine only after 1092. Under such conditions we must consider it merely a faint echo of the times of greatness if the phrase "the fleet is the glory of Romania" is still heard. The population was a motley mixture.

Traders flocked together from every quarter of the world, not merely into the capital, but to the October fair at Thessalonica, and to Halmyrus. The great traveller, the Jew Benjamin of Tudela, testifies to this state of things at Byzantium under Manuel: "Merchants from Bagdad, Mesopotamia, Media, Persia, Egypt, Palestine, Russia, Hungary, the country of the Pechenegs, Italy, and Spain." The Greek population had then revived, and lived in crowded villages and towns. Arcadia, Lacedæmon, Astypalaia, Achrida, Joannina, Castoria, Larissa, Platamuna, Cytros, Dyrrhachium, Chimara, Buthroton, Corcyra, are mentioned as Greek towns by the Arab Edrisi, who wrote at the commission of Roger II.

Slavonic immigrations had almost submerged the old Greek race. Jewish colonists, Albanians, and Wallachians pushed their way into the Greek peninsula. A province of Thessaly was called

Great Wallachia, and we find Wallachians in the army. The cities of Western Italy began slowly to plant their colonies in the crevices of this tottering empire. The disintegrating force of this luxuriant foreign growth must not be under-estimated when we consider the progress of Byzantine



ALEXIUS

Who restored the Byzantine power for a time in union with the Venetians near the close of the 11th century. From old Greek manuscript.

BYZANTIUM ON THE DOWN GRADE

decay. It is not the profit-making powers of trade that we must consider, but that of the colonial system, which ventured to work in the sinking Byzantine empire with its own surplus of capital and surplus of hands. The system of forced labour, which employed the former Byzantine serfs as if they were slaves, created for the Italian communities those riches which we should never comprehend as a result of the Levant trade alone.

John II. Comnenus (1118-1143), also called John the Handsome, averted by his moderation the ambitious efforts of his sister Anna to place on the throne her husband Nicephorus Bryennius the younger; he also fought with success against the Pechenegs in 1122, the Servians in 1123, and the Hungarians, and in Asia against the Seljuks (1126-1137), and Armenians (1137). The treaty of 1108 was renewed, in 1137, with Raymond of Poitou, successor of Bohemund II., on the terms that Antioch should be surrendered to the Greek throne, but that a territory on Turkish soil, Aleppo and the petty towns on the Upper Orontes—still, however, to be conquered—should be ceded to Raymond as a hereditary fief.

The action of the emperor against Antioch was sharply censured by Pope Innocent II. in the Bull of 1138; the Latins were ordered to withdraw from his company and his service. The Byzantine clergy then felt the widening of the gulf which separated them from the papacy. "The Pope is Emperor and no Pope," said a

The Greeks Reject Rome's Claims Greek who was staying at Monte Cassino; and the archbishop of Thessalonica bluntly rejected the claim of Rome "to send her orders thus from on high," since the Greeks, "to whom the knowledge of science, the learning of their masters, and the brilliant intellects of Hellenism were useless," thus became slaves. Gentle and wise, never enforcing

a death penalty, thrifty, since he curtailed the luxury of the court and left behind him a well-filled treasury, John enhanced the glory of the empire and extended its frontiers. Only Italy was definitely given up; Naples, the last possession of Byzantium on Italian soil, became Norman in

1138. The attempt to withdraw from the iron grip of Venice proved a failure, since the latter proceeded to ravage the islands.

The ideas of West European chivalry united with Byzantine culture and statesmanship in the person of the fourth son of the emperor John, Manuel I. Comnenus (1143-1180). We cannot appeal to the testimony of the hack-poet, Theodoros Prodromos, who wrote witty and pleasing verse on everything which could bring money to his purse; but we have better

authorities in the historians Cinnamus, a soldier skilful in his profession, and Nicetas Acominatus. The rash daring with which the emperor, escorted by two faithful followers, made his way through a dense Turkish army, charged alone with the standard against the Hungarian ranks, and after the crossing of the Save did not actually burn his boats but sent them back; his return with four Turks bound to his saddle-bow: his acceptance of a challenge to single combats in honour of his wife; and the skill with which, in the lists at Antioch, he hurled two Latin knights out of their saddles—all this brought him nearer to the western chivalry. He seemed to be an Occidental among the Greeks.

And in admirable harmony with the whole picture is his German wife, Bertha of Sulzbach, sister-in-law of Conrad III., who, in defiance of the stately etiquette of the Byzantine senate and court, gave expression to her joyful admiration of her heroic husband. Even the superstitious liking for astrology,



THE BYZANTINE WALLS OF ANTIOCH

which the emperor defended in a treatise of his own composition, forms a natural pendant to this. Natives of the west received high posts in the army and the government. The great western shield and the long lances were now introduced into Byzantium.

The way seemed paved for a reconciliation between east and west, and at this price the Roman and Greek Churches, according to Manuel's views, might be united under a Roman primate. Pope Alexander III. lent a willing ear to these proposals, so long as he found himself in conflict with Emperor Frederick I. Barbarossa (1161). Then the cardinal-presbyter William of Pavia spoke, quite in the Byzantine spirit, of the oppression which the tyranny of the barbarians had brought on the Church since the name of emperor had been arrogated by them.

In this sense the sanguine spirit of Manuel was understood when he wished, in the year 1175, to win the co-operation of the west by a new crusade. But the Greek clergy were quite opposed to the union, and the parallel of the wandering sheep was indignantly repudiated by the Greek Church with the remark that it had not added anything to the creed. The clouds in the west lowered threateningly. Barbarossa at the end of 1177 wrote to the emperor Manuel that not merely the Roman imperium, but also the Greek empire, must be at his beck and call and administered under his suzerainty. In the theory of "the two swords" there was no room for a Greek empire; Frederick even offered his services as an arbiter in the ecclesiastical disputes of the Greek Church.

Thus in the west, twenty-seven years before the annihilation of the Greek empire, political doctrines were started

No Room for a Greek Empire which simply denied the existence of the Greek crown. It was of little importance, then, in view of the failure to win

over the Curia and to conduct successfully the diplomatic war against the western empire, that Manuel had his own party in Rome, Venice, Dalmatia, and Hungary, or that he hoped to gain the crusading states by great undertakings on their behalf, and the goodwill of the Latins generally by trade

concessions, or the education of Ragusan nobles at the cost of the state. The calamitous defeat near the sources of the Mæander, at Myriocephalon, in 1176, which Manuel sustained at the hands of Izz ed-din Kiliç-Arslan, was, it is true, quickly retrieved by two great victories, but the intense energy of Manuel was broken. The ascendancy of Barbarossa and his own defeat show that his life-work as a statesman and a soldier had not been successful.

Under Alexius II. (1180-1183), a minor for whom his mother Maria of Antioch governed, the smouldering hatred of the Greeks for the Latins burst into flame. The unscrupulous exactions of labour-service and money imposed by the Occidentals were terribly avenged on May 2nd, 1182. Andronicus I. Comnenus, the Alcibiades of the Middle Byzantine empire, stirred up this rebellion, and, as a liberator, occupied the highest place in the empire in 1183, first as co-regent, and after the murder of Alexius, in 1184, as sole ruler. A favourite with women, of infatigable personal charm, an orator whose flood of eloquence no hearer could resist, an admirable general, a distinguished administrator of the empire, whose great landowners and feudal nobility he remorselessly attacked, he was the most exemplary of rulers, and the most unscrupulous of men in his private life.

Once more the administration was to be altered, bureaucracy terminated, and the refractory grandees crushed with iron strength and condemned for high treason. But when the avenging massacre of the Latins at Thessalonica on August 24th, 1185, and the restriction of the games exasperated the people, Isaac Angelus, who had been spared during the proscription, was chosen emperor on September 12th, 1185, after turbulent meetings of the electors.

Thus ended the era of peace in which "every man sat quietly under the shade of his own vine and fig-tree," in which canals and aqueducts had been planned, taxes lessened, and the population of the empire amazingly augmented. The scenes after the fall of Andronicus, when the mob robbed and pillaged in the palace, the arsenal, and the church, as if in an enemy's country, throw a lurid light on the condition of the capital.



FALL OF THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE WEST

THE TRIUMPHS OF THE VENETIAN REPUBLIC

THE reigns of Isaac II. Angelus (1185-1195) and his brother Alexius III. (1195-1203) mark the complete decline of the empire. The mob and the capital played the chief rôle. The weakness of the government, which could no longer ward off plundering inroads, was apparent to all its subjects. The collection of taxes on the marriage of Isaac II. weighed especially heavily on the Bulgarians and Wallachians. Peter and John Asen, two brothers of the old stock of the Bulgarian tsars, who had grown up among the Wallachians and were familiar with their language and beloved by the people, took advantage of political discontent and religious enthusiasm to stir up revolt; Peter became tsar of the Bulgarians and Greeks in 1185. The new empire was supported by the Servian prince Nemanja. The alliance with Frederick Barbarossa did not indeed lead, as had been hoped, to a recognition of the imperial style, and the Servian king, Stephen II. Nemanja, was defeated by Isaac in 1194, while John was murdered in 1196, and his brother Peter in 1197; but nevertheless Caloian (1197-1207) was able to rule over a realm which extended from Belgrade to the Lower Maritza and Agathopolis, from the mouths of the Danube to the Strymon and the Upper Vardar.

The imperial army of Isaac, whose commander, Alexius Branas, proclaimed himself emperor, was defeated by Conrad of Montserrat, with a force composed of Franks, Varangians, Turkish and Georgian mercenaries. The non-Greeks already decided the destinies of Byzantium. The army, which already was mostly non-Greek, was strengthened by colonists and Hungarian mercenaries abroad. The defeat of Adrianople, as well as the crusade of the emperor Barbarossa, showed the complete feebleness of the generals and the army. Of the former dominions of the

empire Macedonia and Thrace were in the possession of the Bulgarians. Corfu, Cephallenia, Zacynthus were held by Margaritone of Brindisi, who was first an admiral of Tancred's, then a pirate on his own account. A tribute of fifty and later of fifteen hundredweights of gold was asked by the emperor Henry VI. for the territory from Dyrrhachium to Thessalonica. The fabric of the empire was cracking in every joint. Archons rose up in particular towns and districts, and exercised a completely independent sovereignty. Where imperial officials, "privileged pirates," still governed or appeared, they only extorted taxes for Byzantium, for themselves, and for a retinue of rapacious underlings, so that—as in the period of the *taille* under Louis XIV.—the inhabitants preferred to leave the fields uncultivated and fled.

Archbishop Michael Acominatus of Athens, a native of Asia Minor, unfolds a thrilling picture of that age of misery. He gallantly defended the Acropolis against the Archon Leo Sgurus of Nauplia, and asserted the privileges of his residence, which no one now respected. Although Athens still retained a reflection of her renown, so that the king of Georgia sent there yearly twenty youths for education,—among them the Georgian poet Lota Rustavell—and although the Englishman John of Basingstoke, later archdeacon of Leicester, praises his ever-to-be-remembered Athenian instructress Constantina as a model of learning, yet the pupils of this Greek culture, of which Acominatus—if we believe his lament over his rustication in Athens—detected little trace, are for the most part aliens.

Alexius III. in 1195 ordered his brother Isaac to be blinded and Isaac's son Alexius to be imprisoned. The fear he entertained of his brother-in-law, Philip of Suabia, is

shown by the treaty of 1198 with Venice, by the terms of which the Venetians were forced to pledge themselves to protect Byzantium even against the German king. The rights of the Venetian consul were then fixed. As he exercised civil and criminal jurisdiction over the Venetians, we may date from this treaty the origin of consular jurisdiction. Alexius III. was, nevertheless, foolish enough to infringe the treaty on his side. Continual demands for tolls were made of the Venetians, and alliances with Pisa and Genoa formed a leading feature of Byzantine policy.

The young Alexius (IV.) fled by way of Rome to the court of Philip, who then sent envoys to Venice, where princes were already collected in considerable numbers for the Fourth Crusade. The prospect of reward, the consciousness of supporting the legitimate heir, and the hope of ecclesiastical union induced everyone to vote that Alexius, who promised military support to the crusade, together with provisions and the expenses of the fleet, should be raised to the throne. The Venetians made use of the crusading army to effect the capture of Zara. They also received from the emperor-elect the guarantee of a trade monopoly. Thus it was proposed that outstanding disputes should be definitely settled by installing a friendly emperor. Byzantium fell on July 17th, 1203.

Alexius III. fled, and Alexius IV. was placed by the Latins at the side of his father, Isaac, who was now released from prison. Disputes, partly between the Latins and Mohammedans on account of the mosque which Isaac had built for the latter, partly between the mob and the colonists, formed the prelude to the vast conflagration which devastated Constantinople from the 21st to the 24th of August. But Alexius IV. could hardly meet his financial obligations, much less dissuade the Greeks from their hatred of the Latins. For him also the day came when the demands which were presented to him nettled his pride, and the words of Enrico Dandolo, the Doge, "Shameful wretch, from the mire we raised you; into the mire we shall push you back again!" cast a terrible light on his position.

The national reaction brought to the front Alexius V. Murzuphlus (the Stammerer), who ordered Alexius IV. to be strangled in his dungeon, and expressly

declared his readiness to die rather than support the expedition against the Holy Land or promote the promised union of the Churches. Then the Occidentals decided on the partition of the empire. The Venetians retained their old commercial privileges. Each party appointed six electors for the election of the emperor, who received a quarter of the empire. The other parts, as already agreed, fell to the Venetians and the Franks. The church of St. Sophia and the election of the patriarch were given to the nation, to which the emperor did not belong. The division of the fiefs and organisation of the feudal system rested with a council of twelve members. The capture of the city was postponed for another year, and the consent of the Pope was obtained.

On April 12th, 1203, some towers were stormed by the crews of two ships; a city gate was burst open by Peter of Amiens; and while Byzantium was burning the emperor fled, having vainly called on his citizens to resist. Even Theodore Lascaris, newly elected in St. Sophia, was forced to escape across the Bosphorus. Unparalleled horrors of devastation, pillage, murder, and rape raged through the streets. The foreign colonists took the bitterest revenge. Two thousand citizens fell, and the terrible scene was ended only by the eclipse of the moon on April 16th. Never before can so many monuments of classical antiquity have been destroyed as then. All the statues of bronze in the Hippodrome were melted down and coined into money. There perished then the works of art in the Hippodrome, the colossal statue of Hera of Samos, the obelisk of brass with the female figure turning at the slightest breath of wind, Bellerophon with Pegasus, the eagle and the snake, the sphinx, river-horse and crocodile, the charioteers, Paris handing the apple to Aphrodite. Only the splendid horses of Lysippus were rescued by the Doge, Enrico Dandolo, and conveyed to Venice.

Byzantine culture, especially art, exercised in this, as in the preceding period, a widespread influence on the west. Greek artists are frequently mentioned in our authorities as transmitting this influence. It is obvious that the east still held an intellectual sway over Illyria and Dalmatia, that ancient debatable land of western and eastern civilisation; Ragusa



BATTLE OF ZARA: VENETIANS, ASSISTED BY CRUSADING ALLIES, SUBDUING THE TOWN ON THEIR WAY TO CONSTANTINOPLE
Zara was the scene of numerous battles, as it was continually rebelling against the authority of the Venetians. When the Venetians, under the Doge Enrico Dandolo, set out for the Fourth Crusade with all the chivalry of Europe, they cunningly got the crusading army to help them in the capture of Zara, though the Crusaders had no concern with Zara.

Illustration by J. M. W. Turner

supplies a striking proof of this in Greek surnames and expressions. The great field, then, for Byzantine influences is naturally Italy. Greek painters (Theophylactus, 959; Eustathius, 1020) worked at the frescoes of Carpignano at Otranto—one delicately executed and one rather rough figure of Christ. If we disregard the

Byzantine Artists in the West vague tradition which speaks of architects being summoned from Constantinople to Venice by the Doge Pietro Orseolo in the year 1000, in order to remodel San Marco, we find in Leo of Ostia a quite trustworthy account of the employment of Byzantine artists by Abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino in 1066. Apparently the walls of the apse and the vestibule of the basilica were ornamented with mosaics, and the floor with tessellated marble, by Byzantine artists; in fact, we can prove that a complete school of arts and crafts was set up by Desiderius under the influence of Byzantium. According to the chronicle of the monk Amatus of Monte Cassino, Desiderius also called in Arab artists from Alexandria. We cannot be surprised that Byzantine costumes were retained in the decorations of the church of Sant' Angelo in Formis, which Desiderius built.

The Byzantine influences in the baptistery of Parma certainly go back to the twelfth century. Greek painters—for example, a certain Kalojohannes—are mentioned in the year 1143 as working in the neighbourhood of Padua. In connection with the cathedral at Pisa the Greek architect Buschetos may be named, and to him may be referred the cruciform shape, the unusual length of the transepts, and the polychrome decoration of the exterior. The transmission of funds for the completion of the cathedral is expressly mentioned by the emperor Alexius I. in the year 1099. The direct export of works of art from Byzantium to Italy is proved by a series of bronze church gates, on the

What Venice Derived from Byzantium bronze plates of which designs are executed in low relief overlaid with silver. Such gates we find in the church of St. Paul outside Rome, cast in 1070 by Stauracius; and in others, including St. Mark's at Venice.

Byzantium created two complete provinces of art on Italian soil. This is attested not so much by our literary authorities as by the works themselves. Of these provinces, Venice was one;

Southern Italy and Sicily formed the other. The first summons of Greek mosaic artists to Venice can be proved to have been given in 1153 to Marcus Indriomeni. But the church of St. Mark, altered from a basilica into a domed building on the model of the church of the Holy Apostles, the whole Venetian style of church architecture with its Byzantine splendour of gold and marble, and the Doge's palace with its bright upper walls, show us how Byzantium has supplied here the essential forms of Venetian art, and how these were gracefully combined with Gothic and Arabic models.

In the case of Sicily, with its large Greek population, its Greek liturgy, its Greek law—for example, the strong influence of the *Ekloge* of Leo and Constantine, and the Greek chancery of its Norman kings—it is of course obvious that there existed countless ties of union with Byzantium. The permanent residence of Byzantine artists in Messina is attested by edicts of the archbishops of Messina. Numerous silk-weavers from Corinth, Thebes, and Athens were brought to Palermo in 1154 by King Roger of Sicily, in order that the "celebrated art" might spread to the west. We may assume bronze-workers from Byzantium for the gates of the Capella Palatina, and can prove their employment on the great bell of the cathedral; and many other examples of the direct influence of Oriental art may be named.

Intercourse of East and West Greek merchants and artists, Greek monks, Greek envoys, and Greek princesses travelled along the Danube on the old Byzantine trade route. The merchants brought Greek textiles, ivory carvings, goldsmith's work, book bindings, and enamels. Greek painters and architects evinced proofs of old artistic skill; Greek envoys negotiated family alliances, such as the marriage of the Byzantine Theophano with Otto II. in 972; and an elaborate court ceremonial was introduced by the Greek princess and her suite. As before, artistic woven fabrics were sent in quantities from Byzantium to the west. The diptychs in the Green Vault at Dresden and at Hanover, the reliquary of the cross at Cortona, the triptych of Harbaville in the Louvre, the covers of the Gospel-books belonging to Count Stroganov and the Barberini Palace, show the appreciation of the west for Byzantine ivory work.



THE TAKING OF CONSTANTINOPLE BY THE VENETIANS AND CRUSADERS

The capture of the Byzantine capital was no part of the business of the Fourth Crusade, but the wily Venetians were chief in contriving that the crusading army should capture the city, which fell to them on July 17th, 1203. The world-famous bronze horses which adorn the front of St. Mark's at Venice were rescued from the awful ruin of Constantinople's art treasures which took place in the reign of rapine that preceded by a few months the capitulation of the city.

From the painting by Tintoretto

German masters had already imitated Byzantine models, as is shown by the ivory carvings of the Echternach book of gospels with the Byzantine Christ, with which the delicately-executed border designs of a Byzantine goldsmith are in striking contrast. Byzantine goldsmiths' work influenced the gold ring of Lorsch. Abbot Salmann of Lorsch, an abbey the façade of which bears a surprising resemblance to those of the Doge's palace at Venice and the Tekfur-Serai in Constantinople, introduced book bindings of Byzantine origin. Byzantine enamel work was well known and popular, as is shown by a description of the process of smelting and of glass mosaic in the book of the monk Theophilus.

Painting in general first influenced the

west through the medium of Byzantine illumination. This in some essential principles furnished a model for the Rhenish school of painters, which in other respects must be considered as under the influence of early Christian and Syro-Egyptian art; in the Egbert Psalter of Trèves, about 980, Greek models are followed in colouring and arrangement of figures. In the eleventh century, on the contrary, Regensburg, so far as the style of colour and form in dress and figure was concerned, had become a stronghold of Byzantinism, exhibiting everywhere Oriental patterns, in the Sacrament-book of Henry II., in the Book of Scriptural Extracts in the Munich library, and in the Vota-Evangelium of Niedermünster with its flat style and Byzantine foliage.



CHAPEL OF NORMAN KINGS AT PALERMO
A notable example of Byzantine influences in the west

Salzburg then made similar copies, as the custodian Berthold shows in his manuscript account of the foundation of St. Peter's.

The Thuringian and Saxon school of painting undertook to develop Oriental motifs. The illuminated manuscript of the abbess Herrad of Landsberg shows Byzantine types in the Nativity, the Annunciation, and other scenes. The miniatures of the Gospel-book of Goslar and of the Halberstadt Missal, and the Byzantinised frescoes in the churches at Newerk and Frankenberg, date from the period subsequent to the Latin sack of Constantinople, when art treasures in profusion were disseminated over the west. Westphalia must have become a focus of such influence, which expressed itself in the course of the century in pictures and Antependia. The genealogical tree of Christ from the root of Jesse, Christ as judge of the world, and the prophets and patriarchs on the wooden ceiling of the central nave of St. Andrew's Church at Hildesheim are deeply imbued with the Byzantine spirit.


We may assume that Italy early

adopted the Byzantine technique of painting, and, by the thirteenth century, the Byzantine tradition of landscape drawing. Eastern influence is far less conspicuous in the domain of architecture, to the earlier period of which seems to belong the choir chapel of Lorsch, which we have already mentioned. The chapel of St. Bartholomew's Church at Paderborn was certainly built under Bishop Meinwerk (1009-1036) by Greeks. We see in the art of the Ruthenians—for instance, in the Franciscan church of Halicz—how Byzantine ideas contended on the soil of modern Austria-Hungary with western tendencies.

Influences of Oriental sculpture can be seen in Quedlinburg, Bamberg, Strassburg, and Rheims. Links of connection can be traced between Byzantium and Southern France—for example, at Toulouse and Vézelay. The relations of Byzantine with Spanish art are obscure, notwithstanding the investigations of Lamperez. The tomb of Princess Constantina, a daughter of John III. Vatatzes, belongs to a later era.



BYZANTINE BOOK COVER FOR GOSPELS
Richly carved in ivory with a border of pearls and precious stones.



THE BEAUTIFUL HARBAVILLE DIPTYCH, A BYZANTINE WORK OF THE Xth CENTURY
 Byzantine culture, especially art, had a widespread influence on the west from the tenth to the thirteenth century, and this fine diptych, now in the Louvre, is an example of western appreciation for the beautiful ivory work of Byzantium.

An imperishable impression was made upon those natives of the west who visited the enchanted city of the east, and saw the splendour of its churches and palaces, by the court ceremonial, which bound even the emperor in its chains. Just as at an earlier period the imperial dress—the crown with the cross, and the coronation shoes—so now the court ceremonial of the west had been in many ways, especially after the marriage of Otto II. with Theophano, affected by Byzantine institutions. The customs of the east were copied both in earnest and in jest; court dwarfs even appeared in the west, such as are proved to have existed at the time of the murder of Nicephorus Phocas in the tenth century, and of Constantine Manasses in the twelfth.

There is, however, room to doubt the statement, confidently as it is made, that changes were produced in western strategy owing to the force of Byzantine example. It is true, the triple-attack theory, which the Emperor Leo's

"Tactica" advised, was subsequently adopted for the French and German battle array; and for the two flank divisions, a formation first demonstrable under Henry IV. at Nügelstädt in 1075, an eastern model is equally presupposed. But the alleged observance of this rule by mercenary commanders in the case of Italy in 940 must be compared with a real application of it in the engagements of 921 and 990 by France, and in those of 1075, 1106, 1128, and 1167 by Germany, besides which the fact of the appearance of the triple-attack system in 843 forbids us to look for its source in the "Tactica," supposing that this treatise is the work of Leo VI.

In conclusion, we may point out how the enlightenment of Byzantium spreads over the Slavonic world as far as the Finno-Ugrian races and the Carelians and Mordwines. On the other side, Byzantine suggestions reached Moravia and Bohemia (between Neuhoř and Rabstein), where the stone-masons make crosses whose arms taper from the centre to the ends.



AN EMPIRE IN RUINS

THE END OF BYZANTIUM AND RISE OF THE TURK

THE residence of Alexius V. was at Tzurulon; farther to the west was the seat of the sovereignty of Alexius III. at Mosynopolis. Leo Sgurus had pressed on to Thessaly. The cousin of Alexius III. was lord of the despotic monarchy of Epirus from Naupactus to Dyrrhachium, Cephallenia, Zante, Ithaca, Santa Maura, Baxo. In Asia the grandson

**Many
Small States
Rise Up**

of Andronicus I., Alexius Comnenus, with the help of his brother David and Queen Tamar of Georgia, had founded the empire of Trebizond, which embraced the coast district of Pontus and Paphlagonia and the Crimea. The Venetians received a strip of country from Adrianople to the Propontis, the coast from Perinthus to Sestos, the islands of the Ægean Sea with Crete, a large portion of Morea with the harbours of Modona and Patras, the coast from the Ionian islands to Dyrrhachium. The Podesta of the Venetian colony in Constantinople became an imperial dignitary and exercised the rights of a sovereign.

For the kingdom of Thessalonica, westward of Nestus, King Bonifacio had to fight against Leo Sgurus and his ally Alexius III. He easily succeeded in the case of Athens and Thebes—both entrusted to Otto de la Roche—but in the case of the Peloponnese, only with the help of Godfrey of Villehardouin and William of Champlitte. The successes of the Emperor Baldwin's brother Henry, the most pleasing figure among the Latins, and of Louis of Blois against Lascaris, are important, until finally, the boundless

**Fire and
Sword
At Work**

hatred of the Greeks for the Latins cemented an alliance with the Tsar Joannisza of Bulgaria. The Emperor Baldwin was taken prisoner in the battle of Adrianople on April 15th, 1205. Fire and sword then did their work. The prisoners were sacrificed to the gods; towns like Philippopolis were levelled to the ground. Then Henry, the new vice-regent of the empire, styled emperor, after August 20th, 1206, tried

to use the ill-will of the Greeks toward the Bulgarians to effect a peace between Greeks and Latins. Theodore Vranas, a friend to the Latins, became lord of Adrianople and Didymoteichos.

The most gifted of the "Romans," the hope of the Greek nobility and clergy which had assembled in Nicæa, Theodore Lascaris, crowned emperor in 1206, was now the mark of friend and foe. Since he was threatened on the one side by David Comnenus, who in the summer of 1206 had become a vassal of the Latin emperor, and on the other hand by the Seljuk Sultan Ghayath ed-din Kai Khusrau of Iconium, who had received Alexius III., he had not shrunk from calling in the help of the Bulgarian scourge of the Latins. After the murder of Joannisza before Thessalonica on October 9th, 1207, that empire split up.

May 2nd, 1210, saw the parliament of Greece meet in the valley of Ravennika, near Zeitun or Lamia. The following was the result of the arrangement and confirmation of the territories. The French were left as the virtual possessors of Greece proper; the prince of the whole of Achæa was William of Champlitte. The twelve lords of Morea were all Frenchmen. Athens and Thebes were under Saint Omer and Otto de la Roche; Amphissa was in the possession of the Stromoncourts. The Lombards had occupied Macedonia and Thessaly with Eubœa, where the dalle Carceri had settled; the Pallavicini resided in Bodonitza in Thermopylæ; on the other hand, Venice had chosen the island for herself, and possessed a colony and the patriarchate in Constantinople. The Flemings, lastly, were in possession of the capital and the empire. In the capital, under the first Emperor Baldwin, the Greek element had been momentarily thrust into the background, while his statesmanlike brother Henry clearly saw the necessity of bringing Byzantium into close touch with the government.

The stratum of Frankish knights and Italian colonists was imposed upon the Greek, Slavonic, and Armenian settlers of the Balkan peninsula. It was a strange mixture of nationalities, of social and political institutions. A vivid picture of this absorption of two foreign civilisations is presented to us by the chronicle of the Morea, composed in its most ancient form in the Greek vernacular after 1300. The writer of the chronicle was certainly a true Frank, since otherwise he would have had Greek sympathies.

The Greek spirit and the Frankish spirit were indeed long opposed one to the other. There were at first but isolated instances of mixed marriages; but slowly and surely the Frankish feudal system, with all its expressions forced its way into the Greek life and language. The court life of the Frankish principalities was magnificently developed. Godfrey II. of Villehardouin was always followed by eighty knights with golden spurs; eight hundred of the flower of the chivalry of Western Europe lived at the court of William II. of Villehardouin. Twelve families were lords over the Greek and Slavonic peasants in

Frankish Feudalism in Greece Morea. Through the strict enforcement of Frankish feudalism the last relics of a free peasantry disappeared from Greece. Frankish castles rose up on the spurs of mountain ranges and on hills which fell away precipitously on every side. Misithra first of all, built on an outlying ridge of Taygetus with an octagonal wall of circumvallation, and guarded by strong towers; then Acova in North Arcadia, on a hill 1,914 feet high, which commands the valley of the Alpheus, and with it the high road of the peninsula of Carytena; and lastly the most complete mediæval fortress, Gritzena, between Ira and Ithome, vast battlemented lines of walls, behind which rise round and pointed towers.

Churches were erected in a peculiar early Gothic style. We may instance Sancta Sophia in Andravida, and Isova above the left bank of the Alpheus, where Gothic lancet windows are inserted in the plain windows of the former Greek church, and eight-ribbed capitals falteringly express some artistic capabilities. A stirring life of jousts and tournaments was developed; troubadours came on the scene, and the singing matches of the palaces aroused the echoes of the valleys. The Franks, with their superiority in

military science, were responsible for the introduction of many new military terms.

In compensation the Frankish knights in Morea after a few decades spoke the Greek vernacular; this is proved by the general statement of the chronicle of the Morea, and also by the exclamation of Godefroi de Brières in the battle of Boula

Greek Hatred of the Latins Lagos in 1259: "We speak one tongue." But the thought of the terrible sack of Constantinople in 1204 had sunk too deeply into the hearts of the Greeks to allow them to be won over. The deep religious difference prevented the hatred of the Latin movement from slumbering, especially among the monks and the clergy. The latter now seemed to be real supporters of the Greek nation. The letter from the clergy to Theodoros Lascaris, in which they urge him as the lawful monarch to enter Constantinople as soon as possible, shows that the Nicæan dynasty, which had fled to the Asiatic side of the empire, were regarded as the legitimate rulers of Byzantium. Thus, the house of the Latin empire was built on shifting quicksands. Morea might, indeed, long appear to the West European chivalry as a training ground in knightly practices and attract the younger generation, but the Latin empire itself had fallen so soon as the fact was realised in the west that it was less competent than the Greek empire had been to provide the Crusades with a base of operations.

The new ground for Frankish chivalry became naturally the theatre for adventures, just as Byzantium itself was an enchanted land. In a Greek region which was saturated with Frankish culture a Greek composed the epic of Belthandros and Chrisantza. The epic of Lybistos and Rhodamne sprang more directly from the soil of a Græco-Frankish mixed civilisation. Rhodes, or rather Cyprus, must have produced these verses instinct with

The East Copies Western Feudalism warm feeling. Less importance attaches to the translation of French romances such as "The Old Knight," or an Italian adaptation of "Flore and Blancheflur" (Phlorios and Platziaphlora).

The west, carried on by religious fervour, chivalrous valour, the joy in cheerful daring and success, introduced its organisation into the other parts of the former Byzantine empire. Armenia, whose monarch, Leo II., styled himself "King by

the grace of the Papal Chair and the Emperor," consciously copied the feudalism of the west. It was not till long after Roman feudal expressions and institutions had acquired their right of domicile, as in Greece, and French barons had been filling all the offices at court and playing a more important rôle than

An Era of Great Trading Colonies

the native nobility, that at last the really French family of the Lusignans (1345 and 1370) mounted the Armenian throne. The exceedingly prosperous middle class of the west established itself firmly in the domains of the former Byzantine empire. The splendid position of Tyre had remained still unimpaired.

The heights of Lebanon, still rustling with forests of cedar and cypress, looked down upon a busy life, thriving trade, and flourishing industries. Venetians, Genoese and Pisans had their own quarters; their trading colonies, under the authority of a magistrate, were grouped round the custom-house and warehouses, where the goods of Western Asia and China were stored. Flotillas, called in Arabic caravans, fetched away twice yearly to their homes the rich merchandise, as well as the produce and fruits of the fertile soil. To the Italian colonists were assigned rich tracts of ground in the open country, where Syrian peasants cultivated sugar plantations and vineyards and planted oranges, figs, and almonds. In the towns themselves, especially in Tyre, purple-dye works and glass manufactories still flourished. Silk factories satisfied the western craving for luxury with costly white stuffs. Italian towns sprang up in Armenia; the Venetians owned an entire quarter in Mohammedan Aleppo. In this way were created colonial empires on the widest scale, which made the fullest use of the native population.

Theodore I. Lascaris, first as despot in Nicæa, then as emperor, thoroughly

A Battle by Single Combat

learned the art of playing off the different powers one against the other, and of employing for his own ends Seljuks, Bulgarians, and Franks. A battle at Antioch on the Mæander in the early summer of 1211 had reduced the Seljuks to great straits; it had been largely decided by the single combat between the emperor and Kai Khusrau. The Duke of Naxos, Marco Sanudo, his son-in-law, was captured. The successor of Lascaris was his

second son-in-law, John III., Ducas Batatzes (1222-1254). He obtained in 1224 Adrianople, and in 1234 the king of Bulgaria, John Asen II., as allies against the Frankish state, and by a successful arrangement with Demetrius Angelus of Epirus he reduced that country to the condition of a province.

Without any doubt, all who made any pretension to higher culture in Byzantium had fled from the barbarism of the Latin empire to Nicæa, to the court of that Theodore II. Lascaris, who, in spite of bodily infirmity, showed an extraordinary vigour of mind. The first step towards a complete revival of Greek life was taken from the soil of Asia Minor. Nicephorus Blemmydes, the greatest scholar of his age, had brought up and educated the crown prince Theodore. Before his accession Theodore seemed gentle and impressionable, meek when blamed by his master, and inclined to the tranquil life of a scholar. As emperor (1254-1258) he appears fully conscious of his powers, strong in spite of his infirmity, and keenly aware of the isolation of Hellenism. He retained his gentleness and solicitude for friends, especially for his counsellor Georgios Mutzalon, but with stern resolution refused to "be humble, or relax the vigour of his rule." He suppressed the Slavonic movement under the tsar Michael Asen, after a brilliant campaign, by the peace of 1256.

Michael Palæologus as "Despotes" took over the regency for his son John IV. Lascaris until he was proclaimed on January 1st, 1259, as co-emperor.

On August 15th, 1261, Michael VIII. Palæologus made his entry into Constantinople. Michael needed all his strategic abilities to hold his ground against the Latins of the Morea, against Epirus, the Servians, and Bulgarians, and against Charles of Anjou. Not merely did he in a war against Michael II. Angelus of Epirus obtain possession of Joannina, 1265, and at the beginning of April, 1281, checkmate Charles of Anjou in a battle at Berat, but he showed a masterly diplomatic skill, which played the Genoese off against the Venetians, roused enemies on every side against Anjou, and excluded the Curia from the war against Byzantium.

A union with the papacy was intended to effect the expulsion of the Occidentals from every Byzantine region,

THE END OF BYZANTIUM

to annihilate the western barbarians, and prevent any attack in the future. The Sicilian monarchy and the Curia were struggling for Byzantium, which was itself the first to profit by this struggle. Compared with that time, 1261, when William of Villehardouin proclaimed a crusade against Byzantium and the Pope commanded the cause to be preached in France, Poland, and Aragon, and wished to devote to that end a tax for three years imposed on the young clerics, what a change was visible on July 6th, 1274! The creed of Greeks and Latins was once more sung in common, and the Greek envoys were sent to announce in public places the participation of the Greek emperor in a crusade. The union of the two Churches had been accomplished by the recognition of the papal primacy, and of the doctrine of the Double Procession, and of the use of unleavened wafers in the sacrament—a result which, as Pope Gregory X. said, "no one had considered possible without secular compulsion."

The Greek clergy certainly resisted strongly any union under such conditions, but Michael knew how to suppress them.

To Renew the Latin Empire The patriarch of Bulgaria and the primate of Servia also submitted, and were now, by ecclesiastical incorporation in the Roman empire, once again more firmly linked to Byzantium. The powerful alliance which Charles of Anjou concluded at Orvieto on July 3rd, 1281, in order to renew the Latin empire, seemed to involve considerable dangers; it was intended, with the help of Venice and Philip of Courtenay—the titular Latin emperor, son of Baldwin II. and son-in-law of Charles—and with the co-operation of the Curia, to "restore the power of the Apostolic Chair." Charles had already ordered the siege train for the investment of Constantinople, and fixed the mighty expedition for 1283, when the Sicilians rebelled against these heavy impositions on March 30th, 1282, the occasion of the "Sicilian Vespers"; Peter III. of Aragon, who had been crowned at Palermo, had sympathised with their cause. Michael was thus saved from the lord of Italy, Burgundy, and Provence, to whom Pope Martin IV. proffered a willing submission.

Andronicus II. (1282-1328) gave the empire a new ecclesiastical organisation and turned his attention toward the orthodox clergy. The sinking empire had

not been spared the scourge of mercenaries; the firebrands of the Catalans seemed more to be dreaded than the Turks, even when the hidalgos secured a permanent home for themselves in Athens and Thebes in 1311. Some light on the panic caused by these adventurers, and on the high honour paid to valiant defenders,

The Scourge of Mercenaries is cast by the mission of the rhetorician Thomas Magistros, with the monastic name of Theodulos, who, in the name of the city of Thessalonica, petitioned the emperor between 1314 and 1318 to bestow some distinction on the general Chandrenos. At that time probably Joseph, a monk, of a noble family in the island of Ithaca, produced his great encyclopædia of knowledge. A marriage ode, ornamented with valuable illuminations, in honour of the wedding of Andronicus II., gives us a vivid picture of the court costumes of that day. Michael VIII. wears a round crown set with pearls, the courtiers white caps with stripes as badges of rank; the ladies have plaited tresses or long waving hair.

Byzantine art at this period of temporary recovery once more produced great results; thus the mosaics of Kachri-Djami, formerly Moni, with their lives of the Lord and of the Virgin, represent faces which are natural and individualised, Peter appearing as an Egyptian. The figures are full of movement as if an admixture of western blood had also revived art, quite differently from the contemporary miniature painting. A counterpart to this varied life meets us in the host of itinerant poets, men of high intellectual powers, who, like Manuel Philes, put well-rounded laudatory verses at the disposal of any who satisfy their hunger and thirst and clothe them with a mantle of Russian fur. A stratum of useless idlers, who think themselves too good for real work, corrupt parasites who by their cringing contaminate their patrons—they are typical of this age in Byzantine history.

A Brief Renaissance of Art Andronicus III. (1328-1341) was freed from the Bulgarian peril since the Servian prince Stephan Uros defeated the Tsar Michael of Widdin at Belbuzd on June 28th, 1330. But in its place came the danger of the Servian empire which Stefan Dusan (1331-1335) now founded. This comprised large portions of Macedonia and Illyria, and also included

Epirus, which had been taken by Andronicus from the house of Angelus (1334-1335). Andronicus was more fortunate in the acquisition of Chios in 1329, Lesbos in 1336, and Phocæa in 1340. The infant John V. (1341-1376 and 1379-1391) and the Megas Dux (high admiral) Alexius

Fragments of an Empire Apocaucus were soon opposed by the grand servitor John VI. Cantacuzene, who, aided by the Bulgarians, Turks, and John Angelus, the governor of Epirus, entered the capital on February 3rd, 1347. We may believe it was less on his own account than in the interests of the common welfare that the Cantacuzene resolved to become emperor of the Romans and to withstand that immense complication of adverse circumstances. He was a level-headed, upright statesman at a critical period.

The position of Byzantium had become deplorable. Disconnected fragments of the Balkan peninsula and a few islands composed the "Empire." The district of the capital and Thrace—a triangle extending from Sozopolis past Adrianople to Christopolis—formed the core. Thessalonica with Chalcidice, portions of Wallachian Thessaly and Albanian Epirus, and the principality of Misithra represented three more disconnected provinces, in parts completely surrounded by Servia. Of the islands, since 1269, Ceos, Seriphos, Sifanto, Sicino, Polycandro, Nio, Scyros, Sciathos, Chelidromi, Lemnos, belonged to the Greek empire; as did after 1310 Scopelos, from 1333-1346 Chios and Samos, from 1337-1357 Cephallennia, Zante, Ithaca; and Lesbos permanently. Stefan Dusan was crowned "Tsar of the Servians and Greeks" in 1346. With the help of the Venetians and Servians on one side, and the Turks on the other, the two emperors waged war on each other. It was John VI. who paved the way for the Ottomans into Europe.

Asceticism, meanwhile, in its most fanatical form had created a home for itself on Mount Athos in the monastic community, which soon became a national sanctuary for the Greeks. The Quietist

controversy originated with the Omphalopsychites, and represented a reaction of the national Greek theology against the intrusion of western scholasticism. The victory of the Quietists implied schism with the west. Their system is the last successful development of Greek mysticism. It may be traced back to Simeon the Younger (963-1042), who asserted the doctrine of the vision of the Uncreated Light as well as that of the Divine Presence.

The West Greek Barlaam of Calabria, who wished that the Aristotelian proof, based on reason, of the existence of God should alone be taken into account, expressed himself most emphatically against the mysticism of Athos. This eastern practice of contemplation was

attacked also by Gregory Acyndinus with the arguments of Thomas Aquinas, but defended by Gregory Palamas, who, about 1347, thanks to the support of John Cantacuzene, played a prominent rôle, and entered into relations with the tsar Stefan Dusan. There are links connecting the old sects of the Paulicians and the Bogumiles with the Palamites, whose influence again extends to the Russian sect of the Strigoliki.

The victory of Palamitism, to which in any case John Cantacuzene, a passionate lover of theology,

contributed, widened enormously the gulf between the east and west, but cemented more firmly the ecclesiastical unity of the Greek world. This religious mysticism was now confronted in the very country itself by an ethical counter movement. The Idiorhythmic monasteries, in which each man lived after his own way,

Strange Monastic Orders and might acquire property of his own, then arose; the monarchical monasticism of the past made way not for a democratic but an aristocratic constitution, in which the two Epitropi were merely an administrative committee of the synaxis of fifteen brethren. The ethical aspects of the common life were developed. An interest in the classics and philosophy showed itself and increased appreciably.



JOHN VIII., PALÆOLOGUS
The Eastern Empire became, under this rule, a small and miserable petty state, though the capital city of Byzantium still contrived to be gay and gorgeous.

THE END OF BYZANTIUM

Manuel II. (1391-1423) lived to see, after the conquest of Bulgaria by the Turks, a systematic blockade of Constantinople. The assistance afforded by the west met with various successes, but the terrible defeat of Nicopolis, by Bajazet I., ended the crusade. The Morea became tributary to the Turks; but the French relief expedition under Marshal Boucicaut effected the liberation of the capital. The emperor a French pensioner, who wrote poems on Franco-Flemish carpets, the patriarch a Russian pensioner—such was the situation of affairs when Tamerlane destroyed the empire of Bajazet in 1402. After 1413 the Emir Mohammed I. maintained peace with Manuel, who with his son established order in the Morea, but quarrelled with the Venetians, who deprived him in 1419 of Monembasia.

The policy of the Turks in welcoming Byzantine claimants to the throne was now adopted by the Byzantines against the Turks, but, it must be confessed, with so little success that Byzantium only with difficulty repulsed a dangerous attack in 1422. For the first time in the east cannon were now employed by the Turks. A terrible devastation of the Morea followed.

To this time belong the curious treatises of Gemistus Plethon, on the political and social renaissance of the Peloponnese. Starting from the purity of the Hellenic population settled there, Gemistus proposed to divide the population into soldiers and agriculturists. Capitalists, officials and authorities were assigned to the third class. He would exclude from all share in the public revenue persons who abandon themselves to tranquil meditation and lead a contemplative life. **Medieval Exponent of Socialism** Man should live by the labour of his hands and not upon offerings extorted from the faithful. All private possessions should become public property; the field should belong to the individual only so long as he cultivates it. Gemistus would abolish the mutilation of criminals and introduce in its place penal servitude. Coined money should be prohibited, as

in ancient times, and imports should be paid for with cotton—a proof of the abundance of the latter commodity. Necessities of life, when produced in the country, should be exported only under heavy duties. In his second treatise, Gemistus tilts violently against military officers who are at the same time merchants. His proposal of a threefold impost—forced labour, money taxes, and taxes on commodities—calls attention to the urgent necessity of fiscal reform.

This Roman empire became under John VIII. (1423-1448) a miserable and petty state, possessing the small peninsula of the Bosphorus and one or two towns, but paying tribute for what it did possess. Thessalonica fell to the Turks in 1430,



THE LAST CHRISTIAN KING OF CONSTANTINOPLE
Constantine XI. was killed when the Turks captured Byzantium in 1453, but the Eastern Empire which he ruled had already dwindled to a mere city state.

while the Morea at any rate became quite Greek. Once more the word of salvation, "Union!" resounds. But not only did the sturdiest opponent of the Union, Marcus Egenicus, declare in Florence: "I will not sign my name, come what may!" Even the nation did not acquiesce in the Florentine Union of 1439. Nevertheless, Eugenicus IV. allowed the Crusade to be preached which led to the victory on the Cunovitch near Nisch on December 24th, 1443, but also to the defeat of Varna on November 10th, 1444. Notwithstanding the severe defeat in the Morea on December 4th, 1446, this peninsula was left at the beginning of 1447 to the Palæologi in return for tribute. There was still plenty of amusement in the capital. Grand processions, religious ceremonies, and dramatic representations were held in the church of St. Sophia, as Bertrand de la Brocquière describes. Now and again envoys were most graciously received—as, for example, the ambassador of Ragusa, Ser Volzius de Bavaglio, who was dismissed with gifts and privileges. Clearly no one in Constantinople realised how great was the danger, how imminent the destruction of the city.

The last emperor of Byzantium, Constantine XI. (1449-1453), fell in the final battle against the Turks, as we shall

presently narrate. He was buried in the Wefa square on the north side of the city; the memory of the last Palæologus still lingers there. Not Greeks alone depict the tragic fall. Narratives penned by members of the most various nations bear testimony to the world-wide importance which the capital still possessed, though the

Byzantium's Last Christian King empire was now no greater than a city state. The theme is handled in Greek folk-songs, which give hope; and also in polished verses which were to rouse all Europe so that the city, crushed by the weight of her sins, might be restored.

Four historians deal with the rise of the Turkish empire or the fall of the Greek. Laonicus Chalcondyles, a distinguished Athenian, who went to Murad II. in 1446 as an ambassador, describes the period from 1298 to 1463. Though he took as his models Herodotus and Thucydides, he was unable to suppress his admiration of the growing greatness of the Ottoman empire. Ducas, secretary of the Genoese Podesta of Phocæa, describes the years between 1341 and 1462. Georgios Phrantzes, the Great Logothete, a Turkish prisoner in 1445, fled to Venice and Rome; in contrast to Chalcondyles he is filled with a burning hatred of the Turks. Critobulus of Imbros, an imitator of Thucydides and on the whole an admirer of the Turks, wrote a history of the emir Mohammed II. to the year 1467.

The Græcising of the Balkan peninsula, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt had been attempted by Byzantium, the East Roman empire continuing what had been begun during the Hellenistic age. The basis of population, however, on which the Byzantine empire rested was so narrow that we cannot agree with the censure passed on the weakness which Byzantium showed in this task. The gain for modern civilisation would certainly have been enormous if Byzantium had succeeded in

Europe's Loss in the Failure of Byzantium Hellenising the whole of the Balkan peninsula and thus sweeping away the multiplicity of hindrances to racial development and international peace. But

owing to the weak foundation which the Greek nationality itself supplied to the Byzantine empire, such large drafts had to be drawn upon foreign nations that only, on the one side, the conception of the state, and, on the other side, the Greek Church and Greek culture, formed the bond of

union for these heterogeneous elements of the Byzantine population. Military genius had organised the forces of this state; literati of the Byzantine empire had at least tried to preserve the treasures of the Greek past, even though they were incapable of producing new masterpieces.

Theological controversies had in centuries of dispute built up the completely independent fabric of the Græco-Oriental Church. But these forces did not produce a coherent Græco-Byzantine nationality, in the widest sense of the word, on the Balkan peninsula. The Græco-Oriental Church is in its essence national, and could not therefore in the further course of development withhold national independence from the Churches of other nations such as that of Bulgaria. The immense mass of writings which Byzantine intellectual life has bequeathed to us shows the strangest curves of development.

Barlaam of Calabria, who, according to the testimony of the Emperor Cantacuzene, was familiar with Euclid, Aristotle, and Plato, had formed a friendship, at the court of Avignon, with Petrarch, and the latter hoped to be initiated, with Barlaam's help, into the Greek language. Boccaccio accomplished what Petrarch did not attain, and was taught Greek by Leontius Pilatus, who, in Florence, became the first professor of Greek in the west. The real founder of Greek studies in Italy was Manuel Chrysoloras. Leonardo Bruni of Arezzo, who pored over the great Greek literature night and day, bears witness to the enthusiasm which then pervaded Italy. Cardinal Bessarion played a prominent part in Rome. Cosimo dei Medici and Pope Nicolas V. vied with each other in collecting manuscripts.

The effect of this study of Greek and of the growing knowledge of the treasures of classical antiquity has been in former times much exaggerated. It was to be imagined that the Renaissance and Humanism owed their entire origin to these envoys, artists, and refugees from Constantinople. In reality this Renaissance, which had already begun with Dante's "Vita Nuova," signified rather a Renaissance of the strength of Barbarism than of the antique. The treasures of the past require the strength of the present, so that the latter may be stimulated to liberate the innermost forces of the soul.

RUDOLPH VON SCALA



THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

THE RISE OF THE TURKISH POWER A NEW TERROR TO CHRISTENDOM AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE EAST AGAINST THE WEST

THE Ottoman power and the Turkish nationality are rooted at the present day, as they have been from the beginning of the Ottoman State, in Asia. For this reason the historian of Turkey in Europe is obliged to direct his gaze from the shores of the Bosphorus steadily towards the East, since from the East came forth that warlike people who for nearly four centuries were the terror of Europe, and still present to western diplomatists the insoluble problem of the "Near Eastern Question."

As regards the origin of the modern Turks, the information available since the discovery of the "Orthon inscriptions" on the Upper Yenisei in Siberia (1889-1890) enables us to describe their ancestors without hesitation as of pure Mongolian race. From the earliest times their nomadic tribes have formed compact political unions, which measured swords with their neighbours the Chinese in continual frontier warfare. They possessed some degree of Asiatic civilisation, including the art of writing, as is evidenced by inscriptions from the eighth century A.D. Generally

The Arena of Barbaric Struggles

speaking, however, the fact is that the great stretch of territory between Lake Baikal and the Caspian Sea has been for centuries, and still remains, the arena of barbaric struggle between the nomad Turkish and Tartar tribes.

During this long period in Eastern and Western Turkestan, that inexhaustible breeding-ground of nations, the seeds were

sown of those military and civil characteristics which are clearly recognisable, in the Turks of Asia Minor, at any rate, notwithstanding manifold infusions of Aryan, Hamitic, and Semitic blood. We refer to the virtues of the warrior who, at the trumpet

Warrior Character of the Turk blast, obediently pitches or strikes his tent, saddles or unsaddles his little horse, arranges his camp kettle where he may happen to bivouac, takes his simple meal, content with the humblest fare, and, crouching on the ground like a true son of the steppes, bears with infinite patience the toils of march and migration, bends piously and devoutly in prayer towards the rising sun, performs the duties of hospitality where he feels himself the lord and master, but where he meets resistance slaughters his victims with the cruelty of the hunter of the steppes, like his brothers the Avars and Huns, the Pechenegs, Seljuks, and Mongols, and so devastates the land that desolation marks the pathway of his feet.

It is impossible to say how many inroads of this nature may have been made from east to west in the course of time by the mounted hordes of Turks and Turkomans, advancing through the lowlands of the Aral and Volga districts to Europe, and through those of the Amu and Syr Daria to Persia, Afghanistan, and India. We know that as early as the eighth century they had overrun the empire of the Persian caliphs, had made their way even into India, and were a

dominant military people among the Iranians and Semites long before they appeared in Asia Minor and Europe. They are said to have borrowed the crescent moon as their crest and standard from the Chinese in 1209, during their sojourn in Central Asia. The first appearance of the Othman, or Ottoman Turks in Asia Minor is

First Westward Movement of the Ottomans

described in a Turkish legend with miraculous additions of the most extraordinary nature. About the year 1225 a horde of some 50,000 souls under their tribal chief Suleiman, or Soliman (I.), were forced by Mongol attacks to leave Khorassan for Armenia. Suleiman's son Ertogrul became the vassal of the Seljuk Sultan Ala ed-din Kai Kobad (1219-1236) of Iconium, who gave him a strip of territory in Bithynia. The beautiful and fertile valley of Sögud, twenty eight miles from Eskeshir and forty-eight miles from Lefke, the ancient Leuka on the Sangarios, became the cradle of the Ottoman state. When once the Turks had gained a footing in Europe the unexampled rapidity of their advance was facilitated on the one hand by the compact military organisation of the new Turkish feudalism, and, on the other hand, by the weakness of the Byzantine empire in Asia and Europe, by the rotten constitutions of the Slavonic Balkan states, and by the lack of unity among the powers of Western Christendom, especially those immediately threatened — Venice, Genoa, Hungary, Poland, and Austria.

But the weapons for this career of conquest were forged in Asia. Osman I. (1299-1326), or Othman—of which Ottoman is the corruption—the son of Ertogrul, who was buried in Sögud, did not pursue the peaceful pastoral life of his father. At first an officer of the sultan of Iconium, he soon rose to the command of the army, secured his independence, coined money, made himself master of the greater part of Bithynia,

Warriors Known as Leg-breakers

and with the help of his son Urkhan extended his kingdom by the conquest of Brusa, Nicomedia, and Nicæa (1326 and 1330). Although he belonged to the powerful nomadic race of the Turks, he called his warriors Osmanli—that is, the sons of Osman, or, in other words, leg-breakers. The Moslems of Anatolia, Mesopotamia, and European Turkey, who honour the memory of Osman even at the present day, regard the name of Turk almost

as an insult. The Emir Urkhan or Orkhan, 1326-1359—the Ottoman rulers were not known as "Sultans" until 1473—is regarded as the first organiser of the Turkish state in Western Asia. He retained Osman's custom of dividing conquered territory into fiefs, called Timars, for distribution among his warriors; in order, however, to secure a more compact and uniform system of administration, he divided his kingdom into two, and afterwards into three, military divisions, called Sandjaks, and by organising a militia force provided both a support for the state and a nucleus for the army.

Ertogrul and Osman had employed only Turkoman cavalry on their campaigns, the Akindji—that is, scouts or skirmishers; in case of need they were summoned as the troops of their overlords and afterwards dismissed. They proved, however, incompetent for siege operations. The first conquests in Asia Minor were due chiefly to the treachery of the Byzantine generals and governors. Urkhan was the first to organise an infantry force, consisting of permanently engaged and paid soldiers, the Yaya or Piade (that is, foot soldiers); they received one "akdje" or silver kreutzer daily, and were divided into tens, hundreds, and thousands, severally commanded by decurions, centurions, and generals. This organisation was outwardly an imitation of the Byzantine military system, which had at one time done excellent service in the Themata or provinces into which that empire was divided. These troops, elated by receiving pay, increased by their excesses, their disobedience, and their exaggerated demands those disorders which they should have helped to repress.

The emir, in conjunction with his brother and the Vizir Ala-ed-din, then resolved upon an unexampled *coup de main*. A proposition was advanced by the cadi or military judge of Biledjik, Kara Khalil Tshenderli, to replace the native infantry by a force formed exclusively of Christians, who were to be forcibly converted to Mohammedanism. This proposal was actuated not so much by religious fanaticism as by clever calculation and a full appreciation of the necessities of the situation. It was from their former nomadic habits of life that the Turkomans derived that incapacity for organised infantry service which induced Kara Khalil to turn his attention to the Christian subjects

THE RISE OF THE TURKISH POWER

of his master in 1330. The surprisingly rapid growth of this force was possibly due to the compulsion which may have been exercised to some extent at the time of its formation, and was also depicted in most baleful colouring by the anti-Christian movement of a later period; but a far more potent cause was the readiness with which the Christian population seems to have fallen in with Urkhan's scheme, abandoned as they were to hopeless isolation and deepest misery by the impotence of their Byzantine rulers.

Far from offering opposition, the young Christians—Adjem Oglan, inexperienced boys—attracted by high pay and other advantages, began to enlist in the new force voluntarily and even at the instigation of their own parents. It was not until considerably later in Europe and especially in Greece that this blood tax made so painful an impression as to be felt equivalent to a method of extermination. However, these Byzantines deserved no other fate. For centuries they had cried again and again, "Rather would we be Turks than Latins." They had gained their wish.

The Origin of the Janissaries These troops, Tsheri, were named Jeni, or the new, and the name of the Janissaries was soon borne from Asia to Europe on the wings of victory. Their name and their distinctive uniform of white skin caps they received from the dervish Hadji Begtash, founder of the famous monastery and of the order of monks which still pervades the whole of the Ottoman Empire. As a truly Turkish indication of the generous provision made for the treatment of the new troops, the names of the officers were borrowed from various kitchen employments. The chief of the chamber—that is, of the regiment—was called Tshorbadji, or the soup-maker; the officers next in importance were the Ashdjibashi, or chief cook, and the Sakabashi, or water-carrier. On their blood-red banner shone the silver crescent and the two-edged sword of Omar. The regimental totem was the meat-kettle, round which they gathered for council as well as for food, while in later times the upsetting of it was often enough the signal for mutiny.

About this date, and apparently at the instance of Ala ed-din, a standing force of cavalry was added to the Janissaries, like them, in receipt of pay and originally divided into two classes—the Spahis, or

knights, and the Silihdaris, or light-armed skirmishers. At first only 2,400 strong, the force was modelled on the guard of honour for the flag of Mahomet formed by the Caliph Omar, and was composed of four squadrons, to which the imperial standard was in like manner entrusted, until this was afterwards replaced by the standard of the Prophet, under **Organising the Turkish Cavalry** Selim I. Urkhan had created the army; his brother Ala ed-din, the Numa Pompilius of the Osmanli, added two more institutions, the right of coinage and the regulation of dress. At a later period the minutest details of clothing were regulated for the faithful; for the moment stress was laid chiefly upon uniformity of head-dress, the fur cap, from which the old Arab turban was developed for the Turks. Regulations of this kind—the "Fetwas"—issued to meet state necessities, form the four sources of Mohammedan constitutional law, which must in no way contradict the three higher sources, the Word of God, the Koran, the words and life of the Prophet, and the Sunna, the traditions, interpretations, and decisions of the first four caliphs, or rather of the four great Imams. Silence or deficiency in these last may be supplemented by decrees known as Urf—that is, secular and arbitrary legislation.

Such legislation was and is subject to change, and modern Turkish legislation, dealing with the thousand conditions of modern life for which the Koran does not provide, is Urf. Here we have the only breach through which European civilisation can legally penetrate. From an early period in the Osman empire, the Greek term "kanon," or "canon," was adopted for these decrees, and the canonical book containing the body of decrees was called "Kanunnameh."

However, the most decisive fact for the whole history of the Ottoman Empire was the accession of the Emir Urkhan.

Hereditary Succession Established Urkhan was not the eldest son of Osman; his brother Ala ed-din was the elder. The latter, however, was a scholar with no inclination to militarism. It was impossible for such a man to take up the government of a rising kingdom, which could secure its existence only by war. With his consent, therefore, the Emir Osman had named the warlike Urkhan his successor and appointed Ala ed-din his vizir. The principle of direct succession

was thus abolished in the house of Osman. The succession depended thenceforward upon the Arab principle, by which, for instance, in the Omayyad family not the son but the brother of a ruler was regarded as the lawful successor. Mahomet himself had left no male issue, but only a daughter, the mother of the sons of Ali. So

Children of Mahomet's Daughter

long as the Ottoman conquest continued, and the people settled in proportion as the army moved onward, the leadership could never have been entrusted to a child—a very possible eventuality under other rules of succession—as the emirs were bold warriors who fought exposed to all dangers. In such times it might be the best policy to have a succession of strong rulers, even though they were not united by the closest ties of blood relationship. But when warfare ceased and peace began, and with it the long and toilsome work of advancing the arts of peace, then a strict succession was desirable; the son should then be able to finish what the father had begun. The father would then find encouragement to begin tasks which he had no prospect of seeing completed, secure in the knowledge that he would leave their achievement to his offspring. If Turkey was ever to become a constitutional state instead of a conquering power, and to lead the progress of Islam towards civilisation, then a change in the principle of succession to the throne was indispensable. Seniority must become primogeniture. That this change has not yet taken place may be regarded as one of the reasons for the present decay of the empire.

The spirit with which the growing state was inspired may be exemplified by a fragment descriptive of Ottoman capacity for culture, taken from the ode "To Culture" of Aashik, a contemporary of Urkhan:

"Empty form is nothing more than body without soul;
Structure in the world is of the great world-soul's design.
Culture vivifies the world; else would there be but soulless form.
Knowledge is the breath of soul and soul of all the souls,
Wanting knowledge, soul is dead and like unto the dead.
Knowledge giveth to the Sultans empire over human souls.
Knowledge wanting; life is wanting. This my word is truth indeed."

An impartial examination of the earlier West Turkish and Seljuk literary monu-

ments shows Aashik Pasha at the outset of the fourteenth century as beginning the line of Turkish poets with a great mystical poem, which betrays the influence of the Persian poetry. Aashik Pasha was a clever dervish of the order of Mevlevi, "the whirling order," which produced several poets, the most important of whom was the actual founder of the order, the famous Jelal ed-din Rumi. His title of Pasha does not imply the court dignity of State Vizir, but that of vizir in the spiritual kingdom. In this latter sense we find many poets bearing the titles of Sheikh, Emir, Hünkiar (monarch), Shah, and Sultan. The whole body of Ottoman poetry, and even the literary language of the present day, was developed beneath the standard of the Book; though the ancestors of the Osmanli, the Oghuz, Ghuzi, or Kuni, may have acquired some veneer of Chinese culture, no trace of this intellectual relationship remains, save certain grammatical forms, and the "Karagöz," a degenerate form of the Chinese shadow-play, which continued the Greek mimes on Byzantine soil. Where

Sources of Ottoman Culture

the Ottoman culture is not derived from sources purely Arabian, that is, under Arab religious influences, it draws upon Arab-Persian sources. Of greater originality and in closer conformity with Turkish peasant humour are the rough jests of Khodja Nasr ed-din, who was a priest and teacher in Akshehir between the period of the last but one of the Seljuk sultans, Ala ed-din Kai Kobad, who died in 1307, and that of Timur, who died in 1404. His humorous pieces were widely circulated in prose narrative form from an early date, and are still read and recited by young and old in all classes of society. The custom of giving place names by topographical description, which was adopted in countless instances by the primitive Turkish races for the nomenclature of towns, districts, woods and rivers, mountains and valleys, within the area of original Persian, Greek, and Byzantine civilisation, finds its counterpart in modern China.

Divergence of religious belief apparently excluded Byzantine influence, although this can be recognised in the material, military, political, and social institutions—for example, with regard to eunuchs—which it imposed upon its conquerors. In the great days of the Macedonian dynasty the Byzantine empire seemed destined

THE RISE OF THE TURKISH POWER

to endure for ever, in contrast to its elder sisters in the West, who had long before succumbed to the assaults of the Germans. From the age of its founder Constantine, and of its legislator Justinian, it had steadily increased its power. The tenth century had been a period of renaissance in civil, economic, and military life, and for Greece in intellectual life also. The empire had triumphantly emerged from the deadly struggle with the forces of Islam. By the subjugation of the Slavs and the acquisition of Armenia, the Byzantine empire had extended in 1025 to limits unexampled since the days of Justinian. The mingled severity and kindness of the Emperor Basil, "the slayer of the Bulgarians," had left the millions of Slavs in possession of their freedom and their native institutions.

Then came the turning point, the beginning of the irrevocable decay of the empire. The great territorial lords made the succeeding emperors their tools, exhausted the resources of the European and Asiatic provinces by their extortion, destroyed the yeoman class by their unbearable taxation, deprived the Slavs of their national privileges, paralysed the action of the best generals by their influence in the all-powerful senate, and when the Seljuk invasion took place in 1071 lost the best provinces of the Asiatic empire, Cappadocia, Armenia, and Iconium. The West fell into the hands of the Normans. The death-stroke, however, from which Byzantium never recovered, was given by the Latin crusade in 1204. The shadow of the imperial government migrated to Nicæa, and as a shadow it returned with the Palæologi to the city of Constantine in 1261.

Instead of seeking to effect a peaceful settlement with the rising kingdoms of Bulgaria and Servia, and thus to save something from the wreck, seeing that the old forms of absolute monarchy had been definitely replaced by the western forms of feudal government which the Crusaders obeyed, the romantic spirit of these shadowy emperors pursued the phantasm of their lost supremacy, the "great ideal" on which even within our own times the finest enterprises of the Hellenes have made shipwreck.

This ruinous megalomania was, moreover, poisoned from the outset by the wildest forms of monastic strife, by

theological quarrels, and by the burning hatred of patriarchs, priests, and people for the "Latinists." While the Ottoman power was rising in the east, the Slav kingdoms were advancing on the north. Servian kings had secured the supremacy over the Balkan peninsula. The power of the Bulgarian state had been broken in 1330, and when Stefan Dusan ascended the throne it seemed that for the Servian monarchy was reserved the task of defending the Bosphorus against the Ottoman advance. But the Slavs were not a sea power, and were therefore unable to interfere successfully in the bitter commercial strife which Venice and Genoa waged for half a century in Greek waters.

Civil war broke out repeatedly in Byzantium. The Palæologus John V. looked for help to the Venetians and Serbs, while John VI. Cantacuzene turned to the Ottomans. As early as 1336 Andronicus, no less unscrupulous than the Christian republics of Italy, had joined the Asiatic Seljuks against the Ottomans, and had thereby lost the best towns of Ionia. In 1353 the Ottomans defeated the Serbs at Didymonteichos, and Cantacuzene appointed his son Matthæus co-regent. Then Stefan Dusan died in 1355, and with him died the hopes of saving Europe from the yoke of Islam. Servian and Albanian chieftains broke away, and Bosnia made herself independent. Thus the Balkan Christians destroyed one another, while the hour of doom was approaching. In 1356 Cantacuzene himself, in the improvidence of despair, called in the Ottomans. Urkhan, already in possession of Brusa, Nicæa, and Nicomedia, thought the moment had then come when the brilliancy of Constantinople and the beauty of Greece lay helplessly at his mercy.

Upon two rafts made of logs bound together with straps and skins, the crown prince Suleiman crossed into Thrace with eighty warriors and surprised the castle of Thymbe—the modern Tshini. The conquest of Kallipolis, the modern Gallipoli, in the following year—1357—opened the way for the extension of the Ottoman Empire in Europe. Urkhan announced this joyful news to the Seljuk princes and his other rivals in letters breathing the full pride of victory. For centuries onward it became the privilege of the

Ottoman chancery to employ the luxuriances of their literary style in inditing documents of this nature to friend and foe.

The emperor John VI. was astute enough to treat with Urkhan, to whom he had given his daughter in marriage as the ransom of Kallipolis. The bargain was on the point of conclusion when an earthquake

The Warrior Who Crossed the Dardanelles destroyed all the towns and fortresses in the Thracian Chersonese, and left the Turks in undisputed possession of the whole of this territory, if we can trust the account of the imperial historian. Suleiman died before his father on a hawking expedition. For more than a century his tomb in Bulair (Greek, Plagiari), on the shore of the Hellespont, was the only grave of an Ottoman prince on European soil; and of all the tombs of the Ottoman heroes was most often visited, as being the resting-place of the second vizir of the empire and of the warrior who had successfully crossed the Dardanelles.

In 1360 the Emir Murad I. (1359-1389) crossed the Hellespont. In the following year he reduced the important fortresses of Tzurulon and Didymonteichos, and in spite of a brave resistance made himself master of Adrianople, the second city of the empire. This town, situated at the confluence of the Maritza with its tributaries, the Arda and Tundsha, in a fertile valley, provided with all the attractions of a tropical climate, vineyards, rose fields, and quince gardens, became, next to Brusa, the first, and after the fall of Constantinople the second, city of the Ottoman Empire. At a later date was erected in it the famous mosque of the Sultan Selim II., which the Turks regard as the most beautiful in Islam.

Brusa remained henceforward the sacred burial ground of the Sultans; and its splendid mosques and baths still afford the finest examples of Osmano-Persian architecture. Murad's vizirs Lalashahin and Evrenos

The Sacred Burial Ground of the Sultans made their way up the valley of the Maritza. Towns, villages, fortresses, and the open country with its enormous booty fell into their hands almost without a blow. In 1363 Lalashahin crowned his career of conquest with the capture of Philippopolis, which had belonged to the Bulgarian Empire since 1344. The Emir Murad made this most prosperous of the Bulgarian towns the outpost of his daily growing empire by the construction of

fortified outworks. Four great rocks of syenite were included in the outer ring of walls, and the Maritza was spanned by a stone bridge. The statement that Murad shortly afterwards—in 1365—concluded a convention with the Dalmatian republic of Ragusa, which commanded the inland trade in the Balkan peninsula, is an invention of later times.

The small Christian states were unable to combine in any kind of opposition to the Ottoman advance; they also lacked a standing army. The emperor John VI. was at variance with his son Andronicus. When he attempted, in 1365, to form a federation against the Turks in Tirnovo on the Jantra, the old capital of Bulgaria, he was imprisoned by Zar Sisman, or Shishman, until his cousin, Amadeo VI., of Savoy, liberated him. The hard-pressed emperor then travelled to Avignon, to induce the papacy to promote a relieving crusade; without hesitation, he signed the Latin formula of union.

Pope Urban V. returned with him to Rome, where they were met by the eastern emperor Charles IV., Queen Joanna of Naples, and the chivalrous king of Cyprus, Peter I. of Lusignan, while Stephen of Bosnia was expected to arrive. Peter of Lusignan had been travelling round the courts of Western Europe since 1362, and on April 1st, 1363, at Avignon, had promised to undertake a crusade in conjunction with John the Good of France, who died in 1364, and Amadeo; however, the enterprise was inadequately supported by the European powers, and the crusaders confined themselves to a temporary occupation of Alexandria on October 10th, 1365. On the present occasion no agreement could be brought about.

Low indeed had fallen the prestige of the once all-powerful East Roman emperor; the Venetian bankers who had advanced the money for his journey to Avignon kept him a prisoner at Venice. Andronicus declined to oblige his hated father, who formally went over to the Roman Church in 1369, by paying the money; and it was eventually his younger son Manuel, ruler of Thessalonica, who secured John's return in 1370, at great cost to himself. In 1371 John excluded Andronicus from the succession in favour of Manuel. In 1375, when Andronicus joined Sauji, a revolted son of Murad, Murad beheaded the Turkish prince and

THE RISE OF THE TURKISH POWER

punished Andronicus by blinding him. However, the prince gained the help of the Genoese, who assisted him to enter the capital in 1376, dethroned his father and crowned him as Andronicus IV. In 1379 the old emperor escaped from imprisonment, and fled to Murad, who restored him to the possession of the capital. Two years later the emperor was reconciled to his eldest son, but after his death, in 1385, he set aside the claims of his grandson, John VII., and gave the succession to his beloved Manuel.

These events form an interlude of secondary importance in the great maritime struggle between Genoa and Venice, which ended only with the peace of Turin on August 8th, 1381. Matters were going no less badly in the Peloponnese. From Thrace Murad had advanced westward to the Balkan passes. He then turned southwards into the fair province of Thessaly and even reached Thermopylæ, whereupon Roger de Lauria, who was governing Attica in the name of King Frederic III. of Sicily, appealed to him in 1363 for help against his Catalonian

The Emir Murad on the Warpath rivals who were in possession of Athens, Helene Fadrique of Aragon, and the Venetian governor of Negropont in Eubœa.

As the allies of Roger, the Turks marched into Thebes, the seat of government and the most distinguished city in the duchy of Athens. These facts plainly show that the Spaniards, Catalonians, and Sicilians were but foreigners in the Latin principalities of Greece, with which they had nothing in common. The news of this movement spread terror far and wide in the West. Urban V. summoned to arms the Venetians, as being the masters of Eubœa, together with the archbishop of Patras, all the prelates and dignitaries of the period within the Latin Empire, the despots of Misithra and Guido of Enghien in Argos.

In the north also a movement of resistance was stimulated by the Pope. The Greek commander of Philippopolis had fled to the king of Servia; at his appeal the kings of Hungary, Servia, Bosnia, and the province of Wallachia agreed to undertake a campaign in common against the Turks, who were now threatening their frontiers. By forced marches they advanced to the Maritza at a point two days' journey above Adrianople, but in the night of September 25th-26th, 1371, they were

surprised by Hadji Ilbeki and suffered a fearful defeat; the army was shattered and dispersed in flight. The battle-field is still known as Ssirbsindüghi, the defeat of the Serbs. This was the first battle in which Magyars fought against the Ottomans.

A year of peace followed, which Murad employed in extending his empire in Asia Minor. In 1381 he arranged a marriage between his eldest son Bajazet and the daughter of Yakub of Kermian.

The Turk in the Balkans The princess brought as her dowry Kutahia and other valuable districts in the Seljuk state. Shortly afterwards other of Murad's troops under Timurtash crossed the mountains of Rhodope and advanced to the Axios on the Albanian frontier, where they conquered the towns of Monastir and Istip. On the far side of the Balkans Indje Balaban had already spent two years in the siege of the fortress of Sofia, the ancient Sardica, when he gained his object by treachery in 1382. Sofia, the most important fortress and the key of Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Thrace, splendidly situated on the Boyana in the wide plain traversed by the Isker, rose again from its ruins.

The Turks had already burst into Bosnia through the Balkan passes, but were repeatedly defeated in the gorges and mountains of the Alps of Dinar by the united Bosnians and Serbs. In 1387 Stefan Vuk Lazar left Prizren and began a threatening movement southward with thirty thousand men. Before Murad sent his forces across the Balkans, which he was surprised to find unoccupied by the enemy, he celebrated with great splendour in Asia, in the presence of his troops on the plain of Jenishehir, his own marriage and that of two of his sons with Byzantine princesses, and the circumcision of his three grandsons, the sons of Bajazet.

The End of the Great Murad The decisive battle was fought on June 15th, 1389, on the field of Amsel. The Turks under the Emir Murad and his son Bajazet opposed the Serbs under Lazar and his nephew Vuk Stefan Brankovic of Prishtina, the Bosnians under their king Stefan Tvartko, and the Voivode Vladko Hranii. With them fought the Croatians, under their Ban Ivan Horvat, those Bulgarians who had escaped the destruction of their country, Wallachian auxiliary troops, and numerous Albanians. At

the outset of the battle—at its conclusion, according to another tradition—the Emir Murad was stabbed in his tent by the Servian nobleman Milos Obilic; Lazar, however, was captured and beheaded, with a number of Servian knights, over the corpse of Murad. The new Emir Bajazet I. interred his father's remains at Brusa, in

Succession by Fratricide the splendid mosque erected by Murad himself. He strangled his brother Yakub in continuance of the gloomy custom supported by a verse of the Koran, according to which succession in the house of Osman was legalised by fratricide.

The new Emir Bajazet I. (1389-1402) was now able to make preparations for the conquest of Greece. Manuel was one of his adherents. This circumstance John VII., the son of Andronicus, who had come to an understanding with Selymbria, the modern Siliwri, and Thessalonica, turned to his own account to secure the dethronement of his grandfather in 1390. Manuel, it is true, restored his father's supremacy; but when Bajazet forced the old emperor to cease the work of restoring the fortifications of his capital, John VI. died of vexation at this insult on February 16th, 1391.

Manuel at once seized the throne, but the sultan punished his presumption by the capture of Thessalonica in 1391, the blockade of the capital, and the conquest of the Bulgarian capital of Tirnovo with Widdin, Nicopolis, and Silistria in 1393; and it became obvious that Bajazet intended to abolish the shadowy East Roman empire. So early as 1392 his general, Evrenos-Beg, had advanced from Seres to the Isthmus. Nerio Acciajuoli, who had ruled Athens from 1385, in place of the Catalonians, made a fruitless appeal to Venice for help, and secured his safety by submission and payment of tribute. From this moment the fate of Athens was only a question of time. When Timurtash occupied the lower part of Athens, the Turks were expelled by the

The Fate of Athens Venetians, who at last came up from Eubœa to relieve the place. From the end of 1394 to the end of 1403 the lion standard of San Marco waved upon the battlements of the stronghold of Cecrops and on the tower of the Latin church of the Holy Virgin on the Acropolis.

It is not known how far the Turks penetrated into Bœotia and Attica upon this occasion. Some portion of the Greeks were in alliance with the Turks. But the

Ottoman triumphs were suddenly checked by the news that Sigismund of Hungary, to whom the emperor Manuel had appealed for help, was approaching the Danube with a brilliant army of French and German knights. Bajazet left Gallipoli, which was then his base of operations for the blockade of the capital, and also Seres, to advance northward against the Christian army. On September 12th, 1396, the Christian troops reached Great Nicopolis, on the right bank of the Danube. On September 28th Bajazet's superior generalship secured him a bloody victory over the Christians, who were unable to follow any practical plan of campaign.

The consequences of the defeat were borne by the Christian inhabitants of the peninsula. Evrenos-Beg advanced upon the Peloponnese, the Byzantine port of which was governed by the "despot" of Misithra, Theodore Palæologus, a son of John V. Defeated at Leondari at the sources of the Alpheus on June 21st, 1397, he was forced to agree to the payment of a yearly tribute. In 1399 the emperor Manuel, who was blockaded anew, approached the French

Christian Peoples Disorganised marshal Jean le Meingre, or Boucicaut, with a request for help, and this general once again cleared the Turks out of the environs of the capital. John VII. was reconciled to his uncle, and Manuel travelled in the West, and met with a brilliant reception wherever he went. The Venetians were then at the zenith of their power. As early as 1355 the Bailo, or governor, of Constantinople had advised the senate to seize the inheritance of Byzantium without more ado. Now, however, they lost Athens in May, 1402. Antonio Acciajuoli gathered a force in Livadia, the strongest place in the country, and captured the citadel in 1403, after a heroic defence.

But at that moment all eyes were turned eastward. When Timur, the Mongolian ruler of Samarkand, began to extend his conquests westward, he came into collision with the Ottoman emirate. The struggle of these two great powers for the possession of Western Asia was decided on July 20th, 1402, in the murderous battle of Angora. Bajazet himself fell into Timur's hands, and died in captivity on March 8th, 1403. But in the spring of 1403, Tamerlane turned eastwards again without attempting to cross the Hellespont, as his fleet consisted only of twenty-two ships of Trebizond.



THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST OF BYZANTIUM

THE CRESCENT TRIUMPHS OVER THE CROSS

THOSE of Bajazet's sons who had escaped the carnage began fighting among themselves for the throne which they had set up again in Brusa and Adrianople. Henceforward Brusa and Aidin were to be the citadels of pure Turkish power in Asia. Christian Europe was too busy with internecine strife to utilise the moment of Ottoman helplessness, an opportunity which never recurred. The papacy was paralysed by the Great Schism. Before the Emperor Manuel had returned from Paris, where he had learned the news of Bajazet's destruction, the eldest son of the fallen emperor, Suleiman, had been proclaimed emir in Adrianople.

The Greek princes hastened to resume their old feudal relations with the Sublime Porte. Antonio Acciajuoli paid a visit to Suleiman in person to ask his help against Venice in the struggle for Athens. From March 31st, 1405, the Venetians were forced to leave Antonio in possession of Athens; he would agree only to style himself their vassal. Yet their power in the Levant was on the rise, and their maritime preponderance was undisputed at the time when they retired from Attica. While Genoa, their rival, was on the point of collapse, the mistress of the Adriatic, under her Doges Michele Steno (1401-1413) and Tommaso Mocenigo (1414-1423) was still at the zenith of her power.

When for this reason she delayed, in common with the western powers, to avenge Nicopolis, her means of resistance were speedily paralysed before the advance of the Ottomans in new strength. Under the Doge Francesco Foscari (1423-1457) the prudent republic sought by the acquisition of Italian territory to secure firmer foundations for her vanishing and disputed power.

The wars aroused by the hatred and jealousy of the four sons of Bajazet in

their struggle for the throne lasted for a decade. Fortunately for the Turkish Empire no partition resulted, but dynastic unity, the fundamental principle of the house of Osman, was preserved. Suleiman (I.) was killed behind Adrianople on June 5th, 1410, while fleeing from his brother Musa; Musa then lost his throne and his life at the hands of Mohammed I. (1413-1421), the third and most fortunate of the hostile brothers, after a victory on the plain of Tshamorlu, not far from Sofia, on July 10th. Mohammed had concluded a close alliance with Manuel, and being on the best of terms with him, gave him back a number of Macedonian and Thessalian places which he had taken from Musa, including the splendid Thessalonica.

Again, and for the last time, the affairs of the East Romans seemed to have taken a favourable turn. The emir had also assured considerable remissions of taxation, with commercial and territorial concessions, to the remaining members of the Christian league, Venice, Genoa, the Knights of St. John in Rhodes, and the duke Jacopo Crispo of Naxos. In the security of peace with the Ottomans the Greek Emperor Manuel, whose restless co-regent John VII. had died in a monastery, was able to visit the miserable remnants of his empire. He spent the winter of 1414-1415 in Thessalonica, the possession of his son Andronicus. He then assisted his son Theodore (II.), the despot of Misithra, to subjugate the refractory barons and toparchs of the Peloponnese in 1415.

At the same time he zealously urged on the construction of the Hexamilion, the wall across the isthmus, which was to serve as a defence against the barbarians, as formerly in the time of the Persian wars. Contemporary writers express their astonishment at this bulwark of defence, as

though it were comparable with the famous walls of Hadrian. They were, however, soon to learn that it was no obstacle to the Janissaries. In 1417 the crown prince, John (VIII.), appeared with the intention of making Misithra his base of operations for the subjugation of the rebellious Genoese centurion Zaccaria of

Albanian Troops Ravage Venetian Possessions

Achaia (1404-32); he then let loose his Albanian troops upon the Venetian possessions also, and destroyed his good relations with the republic. The latter espoused the cause of the centurion, and in 1419 wrested from the East Romans the important position of Monembasia, the home of the once admired Malvasier.

Mohammed, who had been indefatigable in the task of resubjugating the emirs of Asia Minor, had always proved an honourable ally of the Byzantines. Manuel, therefore, displayed a considerable lack of foresight in supporting the cause of a rebel pretending to be Prince Mustafa, who had disappeared in 1402; again, on Mohammed's death, in 1421, Manuel was persuaded by his son John (VIII.) to play off this pseudo Mustafa against the youthful heir, Murad II. (1421-1451). The impostor was defeated, and strangled in Adrianople at the beginning of 1422. In June, 1422, Murad advanced upon Constantinople with 50,000 men. The capital, which had made alliance with Mustafa, a revolted younger brother of the emir, was saved, though Mustafa himself was defeated and suppressed. The work of vengeance could now be begun. First, the warlike Murad sent his vizir Turakhan to Thessalonica, which was saved only by the help of Venice. Andronicus ceded it to the republic in 1423 for purchase-money amounting to 50,000 ducats. However, Turakhan then burst forth from Thessaly to expel from the Morea Theodore of Misithra and the Venetians, on whom he desired vengeance for Pietro Loredano's destruction of the Turkish fleet at Gallipoli on May 29th, 1416. The wall across the isthmus was stormed by the Janissaries and destroyed on May 22nd, 1423. The victors contented themselves with re-

ducing the Peloponnese to the position of a tributary vassal state. Smitten by an apoplectic stroke, Manuel retired from the government in 1423 and took monastic vows in 1424. His son, John VIII. (1423-1448), concluded peace with Murad, who made him pay 30,000 ducats for the Morea, and seized most of his possessions in Macedonia and on the Black Sea.

Meanwhile, the emperor's enterprising brothers, Thomas and Constantine Palæologus, were successfully extending their supremacy in the Peloponnese, where the last remnants of Frankish power, with the exception of the Venetian fortresses, fell into their hands between 1428 and 1430. However, on March 29th, 1430, Murad II. reduced the fortress of Thessalonica, the old capital of the Lombard kingdom,



BAJAZET I.

This Ottoman emperor ruled from 1389 to 1403. He conquered Bulgaria and a great part of Asia Minor, Macedonia, Serbia, and Thessaly, and was defeated by Timur at Angora in the year 1402.

which for more than two centuries had served as a base for the Frankish conquests of Hellas. Under the name of Salonika it became henceforward one of the first commercial ports and naval stations of Turkey in Europe. After the fall of Thessalonica the emir sent his pasha, Sinan, to subjugate Epirus. In that country Carlo I. Tocco, the brother-in-law of Antonio, had died at Janina on July 4th, 1429, leaving no legitimate heir. His fair kingdom, which since 1381 had included Albania, Acarnania, Ithaca, Zacynthus, Cephallenia, and Leucadia, went to his nephew Carlo II. (1429-1448), the son

of his brother Leonardo. However, the Turks took up the cause of Memnone, an ambitious illegitimate son of the deceased, and forced Janina to surrender on October 9th, 1430, after a long siege. Carlo II. Tocco thereupon became tributary to the emir for Epirus and Acarnania. Mean-

The Pope's Plan to Expel the Turks

while, the Emperor John VIII., who was in despair at the loss of Thessalonica, had hastened westward, to make his submission to the Roman Church and to seek help from the co-religionists. To Murad's fierce resentment his appeals for help were again directed to Rome. Pope Eugenius IV. zealously urged a new scheme for reunion, deceiving himself and others with the hope that the brief and infrequent efforts of the West to repel the followers

THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST OF BYZANTIUM

of the crescent would now culminate in a great enterprise for the final expulsion of the Turk. In view of the extremity of the danger, the project of union—in other words, submission—was now considered in full seriousness by the emperor and most of the prelates, including the œcumenical patriarch Joseph.

The "Florentinum," the decree of union which was solemnly recited on July 6th, 1439, in the cathedral of Florence, is of importance in so far as it became the dogmatic basis for the actual reunion of the Ruthenians, Roumanians, Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians, and Maronites. Constantinople, however, held different views. Monks and laity alike declined to confirm the convention which the imperial government and the hierarchy had concluded. The latter were defeated in the unequal struggle against a national will, which, though impotent in all else, was implacably obstinate on this particular point of anti-Latinism. The agreement of Florence was torn in pieces, and the church of St. Sophia was doomed to become a mosque.

In the spring of 1441 the Turks devastated Lower Hungary as far as the Theiss, and also Slavonia and the district between the Save and the Drave. Fortunately for Christendom, Janos Hunyadi, who had been appointed Count of Temesvar and Duke of Transylvania in 1441 as a reward for faithful service, took up the supreme command among the towns on the southern frontier. Among other exploits he defeated the Roumelian Beglerbeg Kulle-Shahin in the spring of 1442 at Vasap on the Jalomita. Pope Eugenius had despatched earnest appeals to the western princes calling for union and defensive measures. At the beginning of 1443 he issued a general circular, imposing a tithe upon the Church for the Turkish war; he also sent Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini to Hungary and Bishop

Christoph of Corona to Moldavia, Wallachia, and Albania to preach the Crusade. The mobilisation of the fleet was begun in Venice. However, the majority of the western princes viewed the enterprise with indifference; exceptions were the Poles,

Wallachians, and the lower classes in Hungary, who took up arms in every quarter. In July, 1443, the crusading army set out under King Wladislaw III. of Poland and Hunyadi, accompanied by Cardinal Cesarini and the fugitive Servian king George Brankovic, advanced through Servia, defeated the Turks at Nish on November 3rd,

reached Sofia, and crossed the plateau between the Balkans and the Ichtiman Sredna Gora at Mirkovo, arriving finally at Zlatitza. The defeat of the Turks at Kunovitz on December 24th, 1443, brought about an Albanian rising under George Kastriot, or Skanderbeg; and in 1444, in spite of the cardinal's opposition, the Hungarians concluded a ten-years' peace with Murad at Szegedin, by the terms of which Wallachia, as a Turkish tributary state, fell to Hungary, Bulgaria was left to the Porte, and Servia was restored to Brankovic; neither Turks nor Hungarians were henceforward to cross the Danube.

But in the meantime the papal fleet under Luigi Loredano and Francesco Condolmieri had appeared in the waters of the Levant; the leaders sent letters adjuring the Hungarians to avail themselves of this favourable opportunity. Persuaded by the eloquence of Cesarini, the Hungarians broke the peace; Murad, who had carried his army over the Hellespont in Genoese transports, met them on the shore of the Black Sea. On November 10th, 1444, was fought the battle of Varna, which after some initial success, resulted in a severe Christian defeat. King Wladislaw fell in a sudden charge upon the Janissaries, delivered out of jealousy of



ONE OF THE TURKISH JANISSARIES

A type of the soldiers whose fortitude and prowess were the qualities which went largely to the building up of the power of the Ottoman Empire.

Preaching
the
Crusade

Hunyadi ; Cesarini was killed in flight, and Hunyadi alone was able to conduct an orderly retreat of his troops across the Danube. Western Christianity was deeply humiliated. The Emperor John VIII.

Venetians attempted to make his peace with the emir by means of gifts ; the **Make Peace** Venetians, in fear for their **With Turks** trade, concluded a special peace with the Turks on

February 23rd, 1446. Constantine of Misithra alone continued his resistance, and with such success that he made a triumphant advance into Central Greece, hoping for Skanderbeg's help. The attention of the latter was, however, claimed by a war with Venice ;

apparently, the Signoria was not ignorant of the revolt among the Albanian chieftains excited by the Turks, as Skanderbeg was in close relations with King Alfonso of Naples, the enemy of the Venetians. As soon as Murad found his hands free, he left Seres in the spring of 1446, at the appeal of Nerio II. Acciajuoli and his general Turakhan in Central Greece, and set out to crush the bold Palæologus in the Peloponnese. Constantine offered him Northern Hellas as the price of the Morea. Murad

answered by imprisoning Constantine's ambassadors, among whom was the historian Chalkondyles. The battle began, the last great effort of the Hellenes against the Asiatic barbarians who were preparing, as aforetime under Xerxes, to rush upon the Peloponnese.

The Turks had now brought that most terrible of western inventions, artillery, to such perfection that the walls of the Greek towns could not hold out against them. For three days their cannon-balls breached the defences of the Hexamilion, and on December 10th the Janissaries and Serbs were sent forward to storm the breach ; on December 14th,

1446, the last bulwark of Greek freedom fell into their hands. The whole of the Peloponnese lay open ; with incalculable booty and 60,000 slaves of war, Murad returned to Thebes, whither Constantine and Thomas had sent their plenipotentiaries in the spring of 1447. By payment of a poll tax they secured the continuance of their precarious predominance in the Peloponnese. A year after this peace the Byzantine emperor, John VIII., died on October 13th, 1448, in the castle of Misithra, above the ruins of Sparta ; on January 6th, 1449, his son received the deputies from the capital, who delivered to him the diadem and purple. With the

emir's permission, to secure which he had sent his councillor Phrantzes at the beginning of December, Constantine XI. Dragases, the last successor of Constantine the Great, assumed the crown of thorns of the East Roman Empire ; while his brothers Thomas and Demetrius divided the responsibilities of the Peloponnese, he sailed to Byzantium, on March 12th, in Catalanian ships. The emperor was received with great rejoicing in his new state, which was limited, as in the times of ancient

Greece, to the environs of the castle. A few days after the battle of Varna, the

emir had again wrested victory from the grasp of the noble Hunyadi of Hungary in the three days' battle of Kossovo on the Amsel, on October 17-19th, 1448. The Pope, Nicholas V., who was naturally timid, was so terrified by this defeat that he advised the Hungarians through his nuncio to remain within their own frontiers ; he urged that it was no longer Greece, but Hungary, that was the bulwark against the Turk.

King Stephen of Bosnia had already reverted to the Roman Church in the time of Eugenius IV. ; Nicholas V.



THE CONSOLIDATOR OF OTTOMAN POWER
Sultan Mohammed II. was the great consolidator of Ottoman power in the middle of the fifteenth century, and in 1453 captured Constantinople and established the empire there, reigning from 1451 till 1481.

Hungary as the
Bulwark
Against the Turk

THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST OF BYZANTIUM

was chiefly busied in opposing the sect of the Patarenes, who were in alliance with the Turks. The monastic and secular clergy, building on the emir's favour, sought to lay hands on the Church property of Bosnia; at a later date the Bosnian—that is, the Slavonic—magnates embraced Mohammedanism with enthusiasm. But of Slavonic race also was the famous Christian hero, George Kastriota, who had begun his struggle against the Turks in 1444, with the victory in the Dibra, and kept the standard of freedom flying in Albania for twenty years with unbroken courage and supported by the Pope.

The same Pope supported, with utmost

to his powerful son, Mohammed II. (1451–1481), who ascended the Ottoman throne at the age of twenty-one. The Duke of Athens, Nerio II., also died in the same year as Murad. Mohammed II. had no intention of allowing Attica to fall into the hands of the Venetians, who had seized the island of Ægina in the summer of 1451. For the moment he sent to Athens the son of Antonio Acciajuoli, who was living at the sultan's court, and was received with enthusiasm by the orthodox population, who favoured the Turks.

Mohammed also solemnly renewed the pledges of peace and friendship with Byzantium, as with other petty states.



THE HISTORIC TOWN OF THESSALONICA, THE MODERN SALONICA

This ancient capital of the Lombards, famous in Scripture through Paul's epistles to the Thessalonians, served for more than two centuries as the base of the Frankish conquests of Hellas, and fell to the Turks, under Murad II., in 1430.

sympathy and self-sacrifice, the course of the struggle for Rhodes, and also that for the island of Cyprus, which was threatened by the Turks shortly afterwards; he placed half of the French indulgence money at the disposal of the king of Cyprus. Between 1454 and 1455 a German popular book was printed for the first time with the movable types of the Mainz Bible, "Eyn manung der cristenheit widder die durken" (in the Hof und Staatsbibliothek at Munich), an appeal to take the field against the Turks and to exterminate them. The pamphlet is in direct connection with the Cypriote indulgence. When Murad died, on February 5th 1451, he left a heritage of war

While, however, he was occupied in Asia with the subjugation of the refractory Emir Ibrahim of Karaman, the Emperor Constantine XI. Dragases conceived the unhappy idea of demanding twice the ransom offered by the Turks for the Ottoman prince Urkhan, who was then a prisoner in Constantinople. The Grand Vizir, Caliph Pasha, who befriended the Greeks, was horrified at the presumptuous folly of this demand, which the Greek ambassador brought to the camp of Akshehir.

Mohammed immediately concluded peace with the ruler of Karaman and satisfied the Janissaries with monetary gifts, with the object of gaining freedom to concentrate the whole of his strength upon


Constantinople. Making Adrianople his base of operations, he cut off the revenues of the Strymon, now Vardar, which were destined for the maintenance of Urkhan. In the spring of 1452 he began the construction of a fortress at a spot where the Bosphorus is narrowest, its breadth being only 550 metres, and where a strong

Emperor's current, still known to the
Ambassador Turks as "the devil's stream,"
Beheaded carries ships from the Asiatic side to the promontory of Hermaion on the European side. It was here in antiquity that Xerxes crossed with his army by the bridge of Mandrocles. Opposite to Anadoli Hissar, previously built by Bajazet upon the ruins of the Byzantine state prison, the "Towers of Lethe," rose the bastion with walls 25 feet thick, and 60 feet high, known to the Turks as Boghaskessen, and to the Greeks as Laimokopion—that is, decapitator. The possession of the two castles of Rumili


and Anadoli Hissar enabled Mohammed to cut the communications of the Genoese and Venetians with their colonies in Pontus. The emperor's protestations and proposals were totally disregarded by the emir, who beheaded the second ambassador, as he had threatened, and definitely declared war in June, 1452.

Constantine XI. now showed further inclination to union with the Latins; however anxious he may have been to accomplish this project, he was unable to bend his people to his will. In May, 1452, the Pope sent Cardinal Isidore, an enthusiastically patriotic Greek, as legate to Byzantium with

200 auxiliary troops. In his following was the archbishop Leonard of Mitylene, who has left us an account of the siege of the town. The festival of union, which was celebrated in the church of St. Sophia on December 12th, 1452, with prayers both for the Pope and for the uniate patriarch Gregor, who had been living in banishment since 1450, was in reality a mere farce. The schismatic clergy were furious with the emperor for his public adherence to the union; the mob uttered curses on the uniates, and the harbour workmen drank to the destruction of the Pope. The "archduke" (high admiral and chief of the artillery) Lukas Notaras, the chief official of the helpless empire, represented the sentiments of true orthodox animosity with the words, "We would rather see the turban of Turkey than the tiara of Rome in our city." With the exception of the Pope and



SOME OF THE STRANGE WEAPONS OF MEDIAEVAL WARFARE
These old engravings show the crude and clumsy character of mediæval weapons. 1 and 2 are movable sheds for protection while undermining the walls, and 3 is a huge sling for throwing stones, while 4 is a portable stage for scaling. In 5 we see the battering-ram in use, the besieged endeavouring to counteract its blows, while the sixth illustration shows a great movable tower combining a variety of uses and carrying spearmen on the top.



SOLDIERS OF THE CRUSADES AND ARTILLERY OF THE MEDIÆVAL AGES

In this old print we see, ready for action, some of the cumbrous machines of war described on the opposite page.

Alfonso the Noble of Aragon, Navarre, Naples, and Sicily, who was really furthering his own political ends, the only Christian powers who gave the Greek emperor any real help were the two republics of Genoa and Venice. They possessed an incalculable amount of public and private property in Galata, Pera, and the Pontic colonies. In Galata the Genoese had strengthened their fortifications a short time before, and had raised their long-famous tower. They and their colony of Chios sent two ships and 700 soldiers under Giovanni Longo of the Giustiniano family. So recently as September 10th, 1451, the Venetians had renewed their commercial treaty with Mohammed; hence the ambiguity of the instructions which they gave to Jacopo Loredano, the commander of their fleet.

Mighty Army of Fanatics Attacks Constantinople

No action was taken by the ten papal galleys which accompanied Jacopo Veniero, archbishop of Ragusa, from Porto Recanati as legate on April 28th.

On March 23rd, 1453, the Emir Mohammed started from Adrianople. On April 6th he was within half a mile of Constantinople with an army of 165,000 fanatics greedy for plunder. To this overwhelming force the Greek emperor could oppose

a total of only 4,973 armed Greeks and some 2,000 foreigners, including Genoese, Venetians, Cretans, Romans, and Spaniards. The siege was begun forthwith; its details have been transmitted to us by a number of eye-witnesses. Fourteen batteries on the land side and twelve heavy guns at special points hurled stone cannon-balls of even 500 pounds weight day and night upon the city. A bold resistance was offered, in which the emperor himself was specially distinguished, as also was Giustiniani with his foreign troops, who worked incessantly to repair the breaches. The colossal walls with their towers and breaches remain as evidence of the strength of the Byzantine fortress, and of the fury of the struggle which then raged about it. The German Johann Grant, by driving countermines at the Egrikapu gate, forced the Turks to abandon their mining operations at the Blachernæ gate in May. Many Greeks, however, instead of bearing their part in the struggle, consoled themselves with the prophecies of the monks, to the effect that the Turks would make their way into the city as far as the pillars of Constantine and would then be driven out of the town to the very borders of Persia by an angel from heaven.

When Mohammed was able to begin his attacks from the sea side, from which the Greek fire had driven him for a time, the fate of the city was sealed. In the night of the 21st and 22nd of April he dragged his ships over a roller-way across the isthmus from Top-hane on the Bosphorus to Kassim

The Glorious Death of Constantine

Pasha. Constantine rejected a final proposal to surrender. On Tuesday, May 29th, 1453, the tremendous assault was begun at two o'clock at night. Sagan Pasha at last forced his way through a breach with his Janissaries. Giustiniani was wounded and fled to a ship. Constantine XI. fell dead upon the heaped-up corpses of his faithful adherents.

His splendid death, says Gibbon, is more glorious than the long prosperity of the Byzantine Cæsars. When his blood-stained body was at length discovered, the Turks cut off the head and brought it to the emir. In fierce delight he ordered it to be placed upon the summit of Justinian's bronze pillar, and afterwards sent it round to the governors of his Asiatic provinces for exhibition. Cardinal Isidore had the presence of mind to exchange his purple robe for the uniform of a dead soldier; he was thrown into prison, but afterwards escaped to the Morea and to Venice, bringing to the West the first detailed account of the event which was to exercise so vast an importance on the history of the world. Thousands had taken refuge in St. Sophia, the church which they had scorned as a means of spiritual salvation since the union festival of the previous December. "If at that moment," says a Greek historian, "an angel had descended from heaven and had commanded, 'Accept the union of the churches,' they would have preferred falling into the hands of the Turks to surrender to Rome."

The massacre which broke out in the town and in the church was checked only by the consideration that the living were of value for their

ransom. According to an entry in the journal of the Venetian Barbaro, the prisoners amounted to 60,000; the plunder was valued at 300,000 ducats, and it became proverbial to account for a man's wealth by saying that he must have been at the conquest of Constantinople. On the morning of May 30th, when Mohammed rode among the devastated ruins of Constantine's buildings, which had seen many a splendid century of time and had housed the glory of so many monarchs, he pondered the lines of the Persian poet, "The spider weaves her web in the emperor's house, and the owl wakes the echoes with her scream in the royal chambers of Afrasiab (Samarkand)."

The capture of Constantinople gave to the emir, Mohammed II., the key to the Black Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean. The new monarch contented himself with levying a poll tax on the conquered;



ENTRY OF MOHAMMED II. INTO CONSTANTINOPLE

The conqueror entered a city of slaughter, and the plunder was so enormous that it became proverbial to account for a man's wealth by saying he had been at the conquest of Constantinople. Amongst the slain was the Emperor.



THE FINAL CONQUEST OF CONSTANTINOPLE

One of the most momentous events in history was the fall of the Byzantine Empire with the capitulation of Constantinople to Mohammed II., in May 1453. The Turks established themselves in the great capital of the Eastern Empire, and the Church of Holy Wisdom (St. Sophia) became a Mohammedan mosque; the Crescent had triumphed over the Cross.

he also attempted to draw the Greek priesthood into his toils by declaring for the anti-union party and appointing as patriarch the orthodox Gennadios. The emir was henceforward sedulously careful that the rights of previous emperors, especially the confirmation of the patriarch

Corruption of Byzantine Officialdom in office, should remain in his hands. In this case there was no possibility of an investiture quarrel. Henceforward the patriarch was obliged to buy his position from the emir, and shortly afterwards from the chief officials of the empire as well, at a high rate of purchase. Mohammed the conqueror transformed the temple of the Holy Wisdom (St. Sophia) into a praying-house of the servants of Allah.

The new patriarch was given the second best church, that of the apostles, as his patriarchion; however, this was pulled down two years later, and the memorial column of the mighty empire-founder was afterwards erected on the site. It was not until 1606 that the Phanarists—i.e., Christians in Phanar, the Greek quarter of the Golden Horn—were able to make the modest church of St. George their religious centre. The families from Trebizond, Kassa, Amastris, and other places, who settled here soon formed a pluto-

cracy, and, as bankers, became indispensable to the Ottoman government, which was always in want of money. The Phanarists obtained the most productive posts, and their daughters became influential in the harems of the Seraglio and of the Turkish grandees. The higher spiritual and secular classes of Greek society ended by making common cause for mutual profit with their Mohammedan masters, with the object of plundering the Christian rayahs.

It became usual for Greeks from Constantinople, Smyrna, the Peloponnese, and the islands to occupy the bishops' thrones in the Turkish Empire and to throng the monasteries of Mount Athos. The Phanariote clergy were bound by no national ties to their people, and were often entirely out of sympathy with the inhabitants of their dioceses

Greeks and Moslems make Common Cause in Europe and Asia. This ecclesiastical and secular supremacy of Greeks over Slavs, Roumanians, and Arabs gradually engendered deep hatred, and was the cause of the intricate linguistic and ecclesiastical complications which still exert a confusing and embittering influence upon the national questions and struggles of the Balkan states. Henceforward, the Greek clergy in every quarter

preferred siding with the Ottomans to accepting the tutelage of the Pope; for them the sultan's rule eventually proved more tolerable and more profitable than, for instance, the hated government of the Venetians, who desired to enchain soul as well as body. Mohammed also summoned the Archbishop of Armenia from Brusa to Constantinople and appointed him patriarch; from that date numerous Armenian immigrants streamed into Constantinople. The news of the great Turkish victory over the "Christian dogs" soon reached every country in the East. The Emir Mohammed had now success on his side, and prestige has always counted for more with the East than with the West. Western Europe, however, burst into loud lamentation over the heavy loss which Christendom had suffered. The literature of this century resounds with threnodies or songs of woe upon the fall of the eternal city. With twenty or thirty thousand warriors and a few ships, Christian Europe might have brought salvation; but now the banner of the Cross had bowed before the sacred standard of Mohammed.

Retribution was paid to the full. For two centuries the West trembled before the Mohammedan rulers on the Bosphorus. The earliest news of the fall of Eastern Rome and the bloody end of the bravest of the Palæologi was received at Venice on June 19th. On June 20th the signoria imparted it to the Pope, who was deeply shocked and at once sent out legates to try and secure peace among the Italian states, which were torn by internecine conflict. On September 30th, Nicholas V. issued a great appeal for a new Crusade, and in 1454 the Reichstag of Ofen appointed Hunyadi commander-in-chief. On the other hand, the Venetian Bartolommeo Marcello concluded a peace on April 18th, 1454, with the "ruler of the faithful," which became the basis

Appeal For a New Crusade of all subsequent relations between Venice and the Porte. The first article of this disgraceful convention ran thus: "Between the Emir Mohammed and the Signoria of Venice exists peace and friendship now as formerly." Yet the emir had executed the Venetian Bailo in Constantinople, and was holding 500 Venetian subjects as prisoners. But the consideration of their warlike neighbours in Italy, their

increasing financial difficulties, and the commercial interests which they valued above everything decided the question.

Genoa also attempted to enter into relations with the emir, and in Naples, Florence and Milan men rejoiced openly at the embarrassment of the lagoon city. The remainder of Western Europe remained inactive. No one, indeed, confessed to inaction; on the contrary, official announcements were made by all the princes of their readiness to help in driving out the Turk. With the exception of Hungary, Alfonso of Portugal alone manifested any serious intent; but his attempts at relief were interrupted by the North African Moorish states of Fez and Ceuta. The mournful news reached Rome from Cyprus and Rhodes that a Turkish fleet of fifty-six sail had attacked Moncastro in the Black Sea, surprised Sebastopol, raided Kassa, Sudak, and Balaclava, and devastated the coast of the Crimea.

Nicholas V. issued invitations for a peace conference at Rome. On August 30th, 1454, Venice, Milan, and Florence there concluded a twenty-five years' league for securing the safety of their states. This peace marks the true renaissance of art and science in Italy. Together with his Crusade preachers, Nicholas V. had sent out a band of emissaries and messengers provided with considerable sums to all the countries in Europe and Asia which the Ottomans had subdued, with orders to discover the manuscripts carried from Constantinople and to buy them up at any price.

Pope Calixtus III. issued a new Crusade Bull on May 15th, 1455. The order of the Minorites worked miracles of eloquence as Crusade preachers; in particular, Capistrano and Heinrich Kalteisen of Coblenz succeeded in gathering and exciting the masses of the people. Charles VII. of France absolutely forbade meetings in his country, and retained the crusading fleet for service against England. Burgundy embezzled the funds for the Crusade, Alfonso of Naples misused the papal fleet for an expedition against Genoa; and in 1455 King Christian of Denmark and Norway plundered the cathedral sacristy of Roskilde of the "Turkish offerings" given by the pious. In vain did Calixtus order that the angelus should summon all Christians at midday to prayer against their hereditary foe.

EASTERN
EUROPE TO
THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION



THE
OTTOMAN
EMPIRE
III

THE SHINING OF THE CRESCENT OTTOMAN POWER AT ITS ZENITH

THE GREAT AGE OF SULEIMAN THE MAGNIFICENT

MOHAMMED II. was confirmed in his resolution to act on the aggressive by observing the fruitless endeavours of the Holy Father to induce the European nationalities to unite for the repulse of Islam. With true foresight the Ottoman ruler recognised that Hunyadi and Skanderbeg were his most dangerous opponents. In July, 1455, he conquered the well-fortified Servian mining town of Novoberdo with all its treasures. In Krushevatz, on the western Morava, he established a foundry in which his workmen, including German, Hungarian, Italian, and other Christians, were busied day and night in casting heavy guns for the siege of Belgrade. Careful war organisation of this kind, extending even to the smallest details and the most remote contingencies, was at that time unprecedented in the West.

Belgrade had been invested since June, 1456; the courage of the besieged was beginning to fail by the time that "the three Johns" approached. Hunyadi, Capistrano, and the papal legate Carvajal advanced at the head of an army consisting mainly of ill-armed citizens, peasants, monks, hermits, and students, with a few German men-at-arms and three hundred Poles. On July 14th, 1456, they reached Greek Weissenburg. Carvajal had failed to reconcile the Emperor Frederic III. with King Ladislaus Posthumus of Hungary. The Hungarian nobility themselves stood aloof. The troops, however, inflamed by

**The Outpost
of Christianity
Preserved**

the inspiring eloquence of Capistrano, broke the Turkish barrier of ships in the Danube after a murderous conflict of five hours' duration. A bold sortie gained some breathing space for the besieged; the emir himself was wounded. Belgrade, the outpost of Christianity, was saved, but Servia was lost. A fearful epidemic decimated the army and carried off the heroic Hunyadi on August 11th, 1456;

the aged Capistrano also succumbed on October 23rd at Illok, on the Danube, the most beautiful town of Sarmatia.

The complete indifference of the Western powers obliged the Pope in December, 1456, to apply for help against the Turks to the Christian king of Ethiopia, to the Christians in Syria, Georgia, and Persia, even to Uzun Hasan, the chieftain of the Turks-mans of the White Ram. The Turkish Conquest of Servia. The Turks had conquered Servia without difficulty after the death of the despot Georg Brankovic on December 24th, 1457. Helene, a daughter of Thomas Palaeologus, and the widow of his son Lazar, who had died at the end of January, 1458, had surrendered the country as a papal fief in the hope of thereby securing its safety. The whole of the people rose against this presumption; they would rather throw themselves into the arms of the Turks than attempt to purchase the entirely unreliable support of the Latin West at the price of their ancestral faith. Albania and Bosnia were soon to share the same fate.

In Bosnia private and sectarian feuds and dissensions were raging alike in the ruling house which inclined to Rome, and among the magnates and the anti-Roman Paterines, whose sympathies were Turkish. The king Stefan Thomashevic paid for his double dealing towards King Matthias of Hungary and Mohammed in 1458 under the executioner's axe in 1463; thirty thousand young Bosnians were incorporated with the Janissaries. In vain did Stefan's mother Katherina bequeath her lost country to the apostolic chair. Hunyadi's son, Matthias Corvinus, conquered Jaicze on October 1st, 1463, but could not prevent the advance of the Turks to the mountain passes of Herzegovina and Montenegro, and the victory of Islam in 1464. The Franciscans were the sole shelter and refuge for the

Christians who remained in Bosnia under decrees of toleration and the letter of protection issued by Mohammed.

In Albania, notwithstanding the treachery of the jealous leaders of his warlike mountain people, the heroic spirit of Skanderbeg offered a most tenacious resistance; in the autumn of 1457 he

Papal Fleet Defeats the Turks gained a bloody victory over the army of Isabeg in the Tomornitza. At the same time the papal fleet under Lodovico

Scarampi defeated the Turks at Metelino. But in the summer of 1458 the Morea and Attica were overrun and devastated by Mohammed's wild troops; Athens fell into the hands of the Turks in June, as did Corinth on August 6th. In that region Turakhan was summoned by the despots of the Morea, Thomas and Demetrius Palæologus, to quell an Albanian revolt; in 1453 and 1454 he defeated the Albanians in a series of bloody engagements.

The "despots" now felt the conqueror's power. A quarrel began between the Duke of Athens and Bartolommeo Contarini, who fled to Stamboul. The emir then resolved to make a clean sweep. Omar Pasha, the son of Turakhan, marched into Athens in June, 1456, while a great famine wasted the land and a comet appalled the inhabitants; two years later the Acropolis surrendered, as we have related. After the massacres in the Peloponnese the emir himself appeared in Athens in the last weeks of August with a brilliant following at the invitation of his pasha. Though his arrival marked the beginning of four centuries of servitude, he proved more merciful than Xerxes or Mardonius in days of old. His admiration of the architecture and situation of the city is related by his flattering biographer Kritobulos.

However, the jubilation of the Greeks at the retirement of the Roman clergy from the Latin church of the Parthenon was premature. When Mohammed revisited the

Parthenon Becomes a Mosque city in the autumn of 1460, he transformed the Parthenon into a mosque, in anger at the repeated revolts of the

inhabitants. In 1458 the duke was spared, but he was executed at Thebes in the next year for treachery. His sons were placed in the Janissary lifeguard. His widow, a daughter of the dynast Demetrius of Morea, was given in marriage to the former Protovestiarius George Amoirutzis, who had betrayed to the sultan in 1461 the

"Great Comnenus," David of Trebizond. Athens was no longer a name of importance in Europe.

In 1462 the Ottomans began the subjugation of Wallachia, whose tyrannical prince, the Christian Voivode Vlad—Vladislav IV., nicknamed Drakul—had roused the sultan's anger by the treacherous destruction of a Turkish army under Hama Zenevisi Pasha. Mohammed's punitive campaign led him through that appalling oak forest where for two miles the army marched past the 20,000 Turkish and Bulgarian corpses which Vlad had impaled in 1461. Vlad Drakul took refuge with Matthias Corvinus, who kept him under strict guard, since the fugitive had plotted for the betrayal of his protector to the emir. His brother Radul, a hostage of Mohammed, obtained the power in Wallachia under Turkish supremacy.

During the six years of his pontificate (1458-1464) Pius II. (Æneas Silvius) had worked incessantly to raise a general crusade. So early as October 13th, 1458, he had issued a vigorous bull inviting the Christian princes to a council of war at Mantua; but the French cardinals opposed him both publicly and privately. King Lewis XI. of France not only retained the crusade tithes for his own purposes, but would not allow Duke Philip of Burgundy to perform his promise to the Pope. In 1459 Frederic III. had received the crown of Matthias Corvinus from the magnates of Hungary. At the Nuremberg Reichstag, the legate, Cardinal Bessarion, strove in vain to heal the breach between the emperor and Hungary.

A Rapid Succession of Disasters Disasters soon occurred in rapid succession. The island of Lemnos, which belonged to the Genoese family of Gattilusio, had been betrayed by the Greeks to the Turkish fleet in the spring of 1456. In September, 1462, Lesbos also fell into the power of Mohammed II. On March 7th, 1461, Thomas, the dethroned despot of the Morea, arrived in Rome by way of Corfu; his brother Demetrius had submitted to the emir at the end of May, 1460, and had given him his daughter in marriage; he died in 1470 as a monk at Adrianople. The daughter of Thomas, the Princess Zoë, married in 1472 the Grand Prince Ivan III. Vassilievitch of Moscow, thereby placing her claims in the hands of Russia. Ivan adopted a new coat-of-arms for Russia, the two-headed eagle, which

THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AT ITS ZENITH

may be seen to-day in the Kremlin at Moscow, and sent an ambassador to Stamboul, naturally to no purpose. Andreas, recognised as titular despot of the Morea by Pope Paul II. in 1465, the last male descendant of the royal house of the Palæologi, in order to relieve his financial difficulties, sold his rights to the French king Charles VIII. in 1494, and bequeathed them on his death on April 7, 1502, to the Spanish rulers Ferdinand and Isabella.

In the summer and autumn of 1461 the principality of Sinope and the empire of Trebizond fell into the hands of the Ottomans. Argos was lost on April 3rd, 1463, and the whole of Bosnia in the summer. Ragusa was then placed in a highly dangerous position. The Pope projected and actually carried out an attempt to convert the emir himself, holding out as an inducement the possession of the whole of the East. At length, on July 19th, 1463, the Pope's zealous efforts were rewarded by the reconciliation of the emperor with the king of Hungary. A convention was executed in Vienna-Neustadt, which recognised the Corvini as kings so long as their family

The Pope's Unrealised Ambition should continue, while securing the succession to the Hapsburgs in case Matthias should leave no children. About this time Venice

and Hungary concluded an offensive and defensive alliance, upon which Skanderbeg reopened hostilities in Albania. Milan and the Florentines stood aloof, watching the Venetian disasters with malicious joy. A Florentine chronicler even relates that his countrymen intercepted Venetian letters and handed them to the emir. In vain did the Pope attempt to dazzle the Florentines with a stupendous plan for the partition of Turkey, the first of the many subsequent projects of the kind which have continued to our own times. When the crusading army in Ancona grew tired of waiting and disbanded, Pius II. died in sight of the Venetian galleys his life's object unrealised, on August 14th, 1464.

His successor, the Venetian Pietro Barbo, Paul II., resumed his predecessor's task with vigour. Of pressing importance was the relief of the bold Skanderbeg in his fortress of Kruja, or Croja. In the event, the Turks were defeated in 1466 and 1467, their leader Balaban killed, and Kruja saved. But on January 17th, 1468, Skanderbeg succumbed to the effects

of a fever at Alassio at the age of sixty. Christianity had suffered no severer loss since the death of Hunyadi and Capistrano. "They have lost their sword and their shield!" cried Mohammed II. in joy. The Albanian army was dispersed, and the upper and wealthier classes of the Albanian population accepted Mohammedanism, while the lower classes, the ancestors of the modern Catholic Gheges, preferred to retire to the life of shepherds and klephts, or brigands, in the inaccessible mountain ranges.

Between 1465 and 1468 the Venetians had gained some success in Greek waters under Sigismondo Malatesta, who died in 1468, Vettore Capello, who died in 1467, and Niccolo da Canale. To the energetic emir this was but a stimulus to raise his fleet to the invincible power which it attained in 1469. His crews included the most capable seamen of the age, Jews and Greeks, especially the so-called Stratiotes, who then served as mercenaries all over Europe. Mohammed started for Greece in 1470 at the head of an army of 100,000 men, while his admiral Mahmud Pasha co-operated with a fleet of three hundred sail. On July 12th, Negropont—Chalcis in Eubœa—fell after a desperate resistance. Fortunately for Christendom, the Turkoman prince Uzun Hasan created a diversion in Asia which drew off the main body of the Turkish forces, for the Ottoman cavalry had completely overrun Croatia to the very borders of Styria and Carinthia.

On June 24th, 1471, the famous "general Christian assembly" was opened at Ratisbon under the presidency of the emperor. Messages of disaster and appeals for help rang in the emperor's ears more importunately than ever before. In vain did the papal legate strive to heal the quarrel between the brothers of the house of Wittelsbach; in vain did the Venetian ambassadors make glowing promises; in vain was

The Miserable End of the Council of Ratisbon it resolved to send embassies of peace to Poland and Hungary. The selfish point of view from which

the lethargic emperor began the negotiations for help against the Turks and imperial reform unfortunately decided the attitude of the princes of the empire. Compared with the great hopes built upon it, the assembly came to a miserable conclusion. Pope Sixtus IV. (1471-1484) also hoped

to secure a general federation of the European powers for exclusive action against the Turks. But on November 18th, 1472, died the noble Bessarion, the life and soul of the movement for resistance within the Curia. He, together with famous Greeks, like Chalkondyles, Laskaris, Argyropulos, and Gaza, had done their

Missioners of Greek Life in Italy

work as missioners of Greek life, to raise those great intellectual centres in Italy whence the humanist movement sprang.

For the moment, however, defeat followed defeat. Disputes broke out between the Venetians and the cardinal-admiral Carasa, although their united fleet had won victories at Satalia and Smyrna.

On July 26th, 1473, the lion-hearted Mohammed had crushed the Persian ruler Uzun Hasan at Terjan and was now pressing upon his enemies in Albania, on the Adriatic, and on the Danube frontier. A fruitless victory was gained by Stefan the Great, the Voivode of Moldavia, at Racova on January 4th, 1475, over superior numbers of the enemy. In June the Genoese colony of Kassa in the Crimea fell into Turkish hands; in 1478 Mohammed II. appointed the Tartar Mengli Giray as Khan of the Crimea, of the north coast of Pontus, and of Tartary Minor, under Turkish supremacy. Lepanto and Leukas were vigorously assaulted in May, 1477. In Albania, Kruja the capital, on June 15th, 1478, Shabljak, Alessio, and Drivasto were captured by the Turks, who repeated their devastating incursions into the Austrian Alps. The Venetian Republic, devastated by a fearful pestilence, then came to the momentous resolution to give up the bloody struggle, to surrender Albania, Eubœa, and Lemnos, but to save their Levant commerce. At this price Venice concluded peace with the sultan through Giovanni Dario on January 25th, 1479. The conqueror, however, did not remain

The Horrors of the Fall of Otranto

quiescent. Leonardo III. Tocco was driven out of Leukas in the summer of 1479. Rhodes offered renewed resistance from May to July, 1480, under Pierre d'Aubusson, grand master of the order of St. John. But on August 11th, Otranto in

Apulia fell into the hands of the unbelievers amid the horrors of dreadful carnage. This news came upon Christendom like a bolt from the blue. In the midst of hurried preparations for resistance the

news arrived of the death of Mohammed II., the mighty conqueror who had terrorised the whole of Europe for a full generation. He died on May 3rd, 1481, at Ankyron, near Hunkiar Chairi, between Gebse and Herake in Asia Minor. Here, centuries before, Constantine the Great, who founded the city which Mohammed captured, had breathed his last. On September 10th, Otranto was recovered by the cardinal legate Fregoso and King Ferrante of Naples.

It is difficult to form an estimate from a Western standpoint of the character of Mohammed II. and of his importance to Turkish history. When this sultan expired in the midst of his army, he had ruled the Ottoman Empire for thirty years, and was nearly fifty three years of age. The accounts of contemporary historians concerning him are coloured either by grovelling admiration of his personality or by hatred and abhorrence of the misery which he, above all men, brought upon Christendom. The cruelties practised by his troops in Austria can hardly have met with his approval, resulting as they did in a useless expenditure of force, and the horrors

Imperial Murder Supported by the Koran

of Otranto so disgusted him that he executed the pasha responsible for their commission. But in order to secure himself in undisturbed possession of the throne he murdered his brother at his mother's breast, and added an enactment upon fratricide to the legal code of Kanunnameh, supporting it by the maxim of the Koran, "Disorder is more ruinous than murder."

After his victory he erected in Stamboul the mosque of Ayub, the prophet's standard-bearer, wherein all sultans were henceforward girded with the sword of Omar. He constructed a countless number of buildings, chiefly through his architect Christobulos. His greatest architectural work, the Mehmedieh, displays in its interior the words of the prophet in letters of gold: "Ye shall conquer Constantinople; happy the prince and the army who shall achieve this." Mosques, hospitals, caravanserais, lunatic asylums, libraries, fountains, and the old Serai were completed or begun at his command.

He wrote poems under the name of Auni, the ready helper. Ottoman poetry previous to the conquest of Constantinople had been dominated by

THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AT ITS ZENITH

mysticism and didactic tendencies. Mohammed II. begins the series of poets of conquest; as his contemporary appears the oculist Sheichi with a romantic love epic, "Khosrev and Shirin," which was merely an imitation from the Persian. Murad II., who had retired to live a life of contemplation at Magnesia, or Manissa, on the Sipylos, was in the habit of holding gatherings twice a week of the "knights of intellect," and rewarding them liberally: he also made attempts at verse composition. The conquest of Constantinople by Mohammed II. gave the empire and the art of poetry a secure basis. Among the swarm of poets who surrounded the artistic sultan were two poetesses, Zeineb and Mihri, who dedicated their divans, or collections of poems, to the sultan.

The conqueror was the founder of numerous schools, and kept such Persian and Indian scholars in his pay as Khoja Jihan and Jami. Bajazet II. followed this example. He, like his brother Djem and Prince Korkud, whose end was no less tragic, occupied himself with art and poetry. The Bajazet, or pigeon mosque, in Stamboul, with its splendid forecourt, remains one of the finest monuments of Ottoman architecture. Before the battle of Jemishehir, Djem, who had been previously victorious at Brusa, proposed to Bajazet that they should divide the empire as brothers. Bajazet replied with the Arabian verse: "The king's sword cleaves the ties of blood; the sultan

has no kinship even with his brothers." Selim I., Suleiman the Great, and Selim II. followed this example, conquered kingdoms, and cherished the Muses amid all their cruelties. Mention must also be made at this point of the sheikh Vefasade. His dominant personality and his character of the old Roman type made him typical of the sages who adorned this period of Mohammed II. In his time occurred the first installation of a poet laureate in the

person of Sati, who was commissioned to produce yearly three Kasside (poems on special subjects), at the beginning of spring and at the two festivals of Beiram. It must be said that the skilful management of rhyme and metre was the first consideration with the Ottoman poet. Form was to him more important than content, manner than matter, description than feeling; his poetical forms were derived chiefly from the Arabs, the spirit and home of the desert.

After the death of Mohammed II., two dangers threatened the Turkish Empire—revolt on the part of the Janissaries and internal disruption. Both of these were overcome by Bajazet II. (1481-1512). To the Janissaries he made rich presents; indeed, the presents given to these prætorian guards rose at every change in the succession, until their delivery three centuries later brought about a financial crisis. Prince Djem, on the other hand, was for a long time a source of fear and anxiety to the sultan



THE MOSQUE OF THE PROPHET'S STANDARD-BEARER
The famous mosque of Ayub, the Prophet's standard-bearer, was erected at Stamboul by Mohammed II. after his conquest of Constantinople, and here henceforward each successive sultan girded on the sword of Omar. It is an excellent example of Ottoman architecture.

in the hands of his enemies. Beaten at Jenishehir on June 20th, 1481, he fled from Konia to Cairo; defeated at Konia with Kasimbeg of Karaman in the spring of 1482, he took refuge with the knights of Rhodes, on July 23rd; in return for an annual subsidy of 45,000 ducats from Turkey, they kept him confined at Rousillon, a commandery of the order on the Rhone; after February, 1483, he was kept at Le Puy. All the princes of Europe rivalled one another in their efforts to get the "Grand Turk" into their power. On March 13th, 1489, the prince, famous, like his brother, as a poet, entered the Vatican as a prisoner in honourable confinement. On February 24th, 1495, he died at Naples, after Pope Alexander VI. had been compelled to hand him over to Charles VIII. of France. He was presumed to have died from poison administered to him in Rome by the Pope, who was paid by Bajazet for this service.

Bajazet's court had now become the arena of the diplomatists of Europe. Embassies and proposals for conventions had replaced the sword. The six Italian powers were the chief rivals for the sultan's favour; they did not shrink upon occasion from employing the help of the infidels to procure the destruction of their Christian opponents. While Bajazet conquered Kilia and Akjerman, two important points in Moldavia, and while the Emperor Frederic III. was embroiled with Matthias Corvinus in further disputes upon the succession after the death of the King of Hungary on April 6th, 1490, Spain conquered Granada in 1492, and was consequently able to interfere independently in the course of European affairs. A short time previously, King Ferrante I. of Naples had secretly supported the Moors against the Spaniards. He now concluded peace with Spain, from whose harbour of Palos the Pope's


The Jews Expelled From Spain great compatriot, Columbus, had sailed to the discovery of a new world. Impressed by these events, the sultan sent the Pope the sacred lance of Longinus as a most valuable present. The decree of the Grand Inquisitor Torquemada of March 31st, 1492, expelled 300,000 Jews from Spain; they were hospitably received by Bajazet, who settled them in Constantinople, Salonica, Smyrna, and Aleppo. From their great centres of refuge the

Spanioles, or Sephardim, rose to positions of high honour and wealth, even as diplomatists in the service of the Porte, and were therein surpassed only by Greeks, Armenians, and Levantines.

On March 31st, 1495, a holy league was concluded by Venice, Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, Maximilian I., Lodovico il Moro, and the Pope for the protection of Christianity against the Turks. None the less, several Hungarian towns in Bosnia were conquered in 1496. In 1497 the Turks, Tartars, and Wallachians burst into Poland, devastating the land far and wide from Lemberg and Przemysl to Banczug. On August 26th, 1499, fell Lepanto, the only possession remaining to Venice on the Gulf of Corinth. Starting from Bosnia the Turks devastated the Venetian continent to the neighbourhood of Vicenza. The coasts of Scuthern Italy were plundered; in August, 1500, the Venetians lost Modon, Navarino, and Koron in the Morea. In vain did Alexander VI. issue a great jubilee indulgence.

Benedetto Pesaro succeeded in reconquering Ægina; towards the end of the same year, Cephalenia; Alessio in 1501, and Santa Maura (Leukas) in 1502; but in 1501 Durazzo was lost, as also was Butrinto in 1502. **Venice Reaps the Fruits of Peace** Venice was reaping the fruits of her former careless peace policy; under the peace of October 6th, 1505, she was obliged to return Santa Maura. Hungary, which had accomplished nothing save a few marauding raids upon Turkish territory, had concluded a seven years' armistice on October 20th. The Holy Roman Empire was not even able to collect the "common penny" which had been voted at repeated diets. In vain did the humanist Jakob Wimpheling of Strassburg complain in 1505 in his "Epitome rerum Germanicarum" of the decay of the empire, the selfishness of the princes, and the advance of the Turks. Fifty years before Hans Rosenblüt had uttered an emphatic warning in "The Turk's Carnival Play": "Our master the Turk is rich and strong, and is very reverent to his God, so that He supports him, and all his affairs prosper. Whatever he has begun has turned out according to his desire."

The last years of Sultan Bajazet were troubled by disturbances within the empire and revolts excited by his sons. The Janissaries, who had placed him on the



CONTEMPORARY PLAN OF CONSTANTINOPLE IN THE YEAR 1520

This plan, published in Venice about the year 1520, shows the city as it was two generations after the Ottoman Conquest.

throne, obliged him to abdicate on April 25th, 1512, in favour of his third son, Selim.

Selim I. (1512-1520), an imperious and warlike character, revived the plans of Mohammed II., and threatened Christianity with death and destruction. After poisoning his father Bajazet, two brothers, and five nephews, he built a powerful fleet of 500 sail; conquered the Shah Ismail of Persia at Khaldyran on August 23rd, 1514, after arousing him to fight on Turkish soil by the capture and murder of 40,000 Shiites; conquered Armenia, the west of Aserbeijan, Kurdistan, and Mesopotamia; and in 1516 overthrew in Syria and Palestine the mighty kingdoms of the Egyptian Mamelukes, with which his father had been unable to cope.

After the battle of Heliopolis he marched into Cairo on January 26th, 1517. Tuman II. Bey, the last of the Burjites, was taken prisoner, and executed on April 13th. Selim had the most beautiful marble pillars of the citadel broken out and taken to Stamboul. Cairo was reduced to the position of a provincial town. The richest merchants emigrated to Constantinople. Selim, being recognised as protector by Mecca and Medina, forced the last descendant of the

Abbassid caliphs, Mutavakkil, to surrender his rights of supremacy, that he might himself thus become caliph; that is, the spiritual and temporal head of all the followers of Islam. His position as such was recognised neither by the Persian Shiites nor by the fanatical Arabs of the sacred cities, who regarded their Shereef as their spiritual head and as related to the prophet. At the time, however, the event implied the highest limit of power in the East.

Algiers had also fallen into Turkish hands. The towns on the Italian seaboard were now harried by the descents of the Turkish corsairs. In Hungary the Turkish problem had grown more acute than ever before. Carniola, Styria, Carinthia, and Austria lay open to Turkish attacks. At the peace congress of Cambrai in 1517 the Emperor Maximilian I. proposed a detailed scheme for the partition of Turkey to the monarchs, by the adoption of which their differences might be settled with the utmost profit to all concerned. At the imperial diet in Augsburg, in 1518, the crusade of Leo X. was approved. Nothing was done, however.

But a few years and two main outposts of Christendom fell into the hands of the

Ottomans—Belgrade on August 29th, 1521, and Rhodes on December 21st, 1522. Selim's son, the glorious Suleiman, had ascended the throne. In honour of his father he built the splendid Selimiye mosque on the fifth hill of Stamboul, and placed the following inscription on the warrior king's grave: "Here rests Selim,

Suleiman's the terror of the
Revenge on the world; yet his body
Knights of St. John alone is here, his heart
is still in battle." He

avenged upon the Knights of St. John the defeat which the conqueror of Byzantium had suffered before Rhodes, in 1480; after a heroic defence and a six months' siege the strong island-fortress fell. A son of Djem, whom Suleiman found in Rhodes, was strangled. The inhabitants of the island migrated in 1527 to the barren Malta which Charles V. presented to them, the Pope confirming their possession.

Similarly, in the case of Belgrade, Suleiman avenged the repulse which Mohammed II. had suffered there in 1456 by his capture of the city. Europe trembled with fear, imagining his "riders and wasters" already before Vienna. A German ballad of 1522 depicts the terror which then pervaded the Holy Roman Empire: "The furious Turk has lately brought great forces into Hungary, has overcome Greek Weissenburg, and thereon he prides himself. From Hungary he has quickly and lightly entered Austria in the light of day; Bavaria is his for the taking; thence he presses onward, and may soon come to the Rhine, for which cause we have no peace nor rest. Our carelessness and selfishness, our proud distrust, hate, envy, and jealousy against our neighbours, these it is that give the Turk his victories."

In truth, in 1522, the Turks had already devastated a part of Hungary and were meditating an incursion into Lower Austria and Bavaria. Mehmed Bey had occupied Wallachia; in May he ravaged the whole of the Karst to Friuli, and sat down before Laibach. The Venetians made no effort upon the loss of Rhodes; they remained secure in Candia. Francis I., "the most Christian king of France," actually sought

an alliance with the sultan against the emperor. The noble oligarchy in Hungary were not indisposed to accept the Grand Turk as their ruler. John Zapolya, count of Zips and voivode of Transylvania, attempted to secure the Hungarian throne with the sultan's help. Peterwardein on the Danube was captured by the Grand Vizir.

Then on August 29th, 1526, followed the decisive battle in the plain of Mohacs, where the Christian army with its king was defeated after a heroic struggle. Lewis II. himself, the last Jagiello ruler of Hungary, was drowned in a swamp while in flight. Two thousand heads were placed on pikes before the grand master's tent. Four thousand prisoners were massacred, Ofen was reduced to ashes, and the land

was ravaged as far as Raab and "the Etzelburg" Gran. Zapolya, who had done homage to the sultan on his knees, received the crown of the country from Ofen to Stuhlweissenburg, and was crowned at the latter town on November 11th. King Ferdinand, the brother-in-law of the fallen Lewis, was elected king of Hungary at Pressburg on December 16th; the day of Mohacs thus became the birthday of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Henceforward all the enemies of the Emperor Charles V. and of King Ferdinand were on the side of the Turks and Zapolya. Even the dukes William and Lewis of Bavaria entered into secret negotia-



THE GREAT SULEIMAN

Under this greatest of all sultans the Ottoman power reached its zenith. While he ruled "sword and pen were never dry," for he fostered the arts as keenly as he fought "the infidels." His was the Augustan age of Ottoman history.

tions with the Grand Turk in regard to their claims to Bohemia.

The sultan forthwith sent the following intimation to King Ferdinand in an open letter: "With reference to the loss of our crown, you may fully expect that we shall visit you at Vienna shortly with thirteen kingdoms, and bring the most miserable death that we can devise upon all your helpers." The advance of the Turks and the fact that a Turkish fleet was cruising off Sicily expedited the conclusion of entire peace between the Emperor Charles V. and the Pope at Barcelona on June 29th, 1529, two months after the dispersal of the diet of Speyer. Francis I. had also made peace with the emperor at Cambrai, though

**Emperor
and Pope
at Peace**



INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE GREAT MOSQUE OF SULEIMAN AT STAMBOUL

he remained in secret communication with the "Lord of all lords, the dispenser of crowns to the monarchs of the earth, the shadow of God over both worlds."

In 1528 Zapolya was forced to adopt Henry, the son of Francis, as the successor to Hungary. On September 21st the Turks appeared before Vienna. Their army was

A Quarter of a Million Turks Attack Vienna 250,000 strong, occupying sixteen encampments and 25,000 tents. Count Nikolaus Salm had evacuated the sub-

urbs, and burnt and dismantled the castle on the Kahlenberg. With the courage of despair he established himself in the city with a garrison of 12,000 men. The imperial army voted by the diet of Speyer and the Protestants consisted of 100 horse and 14 companies of infantry. Yet, frequent sorties were made and five vigorous assaults repulsed. Suleiman had sworn to take no rest until the prayer of the prophet was delivered from the tower of Stephan's church; nevertheless, on October 15th want of supplies, unfavourable weather, and dissatisfaction among the Janissaries obliged him to raise the siege.

The wave of advancing Turkish power had been broken upon the walls of Vienna. But Hungary remained in the sultan's hands, held in feudal tenure by Zapolya. The Venetians hastened to send assurances of their goodwill to the sultan and the voivode, to whom they had done good service as spies. Aided by the religious confusion in Germany, Kasimbeg carried devastation through Austria, as did Zapolya with the Wallachians through Moravia and Silesia. Resistance was offered by an army of the empire and the forces of Charles V., amounting in all to 50,000 men. Clement VII. sent money and his nephew Hippolito dei Medici. Once again the Mohammedan advance was broken before Güns, which was heroically defended by Niklas Jurishitz from August 9th to 28th, 1532. But the imperial army dispersed

Luther Advises the People not to Resist the Turks again. When Ferdinand's ambassador boasted of the emperor's power to Ibrahim Pasha, the Grand Vizir in-

terrupted him with the words: "Has he made peace with Martin Luther?" Luther's attitude towards the Turkish danger is remarkable. Luther advised the people not to give help against the Turks, "seeing that the Turk is ten times cleverer and more pious than our princes." Hans Sachs, the enthusiastic poet of the Reformation, repeatedly

sings of victory over the arch enemy in his poems and satires (1529). "Awake, my heart, my mind, and my good cheer, help me to praise the man at arms as is his due; his knightly deeds have been performed in Austria, even at Vienna in the city."

Luther, on the other hand, in his table talk and in his "army sermon against the Turks" in 1529, often used language which can be explained only as prompted by the deepest despair at the disunion of the rulers and the slow progress of the evangelical movement. "The Venetians," says Luther, "have done nothing of note; they are not warriors, but pepper bags. Had Germany a master, we could easily resist the Turk, but the Papists are our worst enemies, and would rather see Germany laid waste. The Papists will say that the Turk has come because of my teaching, that God has sent him to scourge Germany because Luther and his doctrine is not rooted out. But I would rather have the Turks as enemies (*sic*) than the Spaniards as protectors. As the Pope has robbed us before of our money with his indulgence in the name of the Turkish war, so also for our money will the Turk de-

Luther Charges the Pope With Robbery vour us, following the Pope's example. So may our dear Lord Jesus Christ help us and strike both Pope and Turk to

the ground." Luther, however, does express patriotic sentiments. To him the Turks are *populus iræ Dei*, children of wrath, servants of the devil; he utters emphatic warnings against apostasy to Islam, cheers the courageous, and consoles the prisoners. In sharp language he points the contrast between Turkish discipline and German lawlessness. But the point of dispute among the Christians continually recurs: "To go to Turkey is to go to the devil; to remain under the Pope is to fall into hell."

At length a peace was patched up between the sultan and the emperor in the summer of 1533. Suleiman employed this breathing-space to cross the Euphrates and to settle accounts with the Persians. He captured Tebriz, Tauris, and Bagdad, returning in triumph in January, 1536. To the year 1535 belong the "capitulations" concluded between Francis I. and the Porte, which served as a basis for all later conventions of the kind with other nations, with a special reference to France, the nation that was always on friendly terms and most favourably treated. These agreements secured free trade for the

THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AT ITS ZENITH

Turks in France and for the "Franks" in all Turkish countries. They formed the point of departure for the principle of consular jurisdiction, provided for the great question of the holy places, and stipulated for a kind of protectorate over the Latin (Catholic) subjects of the Grand Turk, on which the modern French "protectorate" is based.

It was in order to alleviate the miseries of the prisoners of war and to check the enormous growth of piracy, that Charles V. undertook his famous expedition against Tunis in 1535. Goletta was conquered, many guns were taken as booty, including cannons stamped with the French lilies, 20,000 Christian slaves were set free, and Muley Hasan was allowed to hold Tunis

common enemy." and struck commemorative medals with the inscription, "Non contra fidem, sed contra Carolum." He and the Venetian republic contributed so large a sum for the sultan's help that the latter boasted that the king of France was more profitable to him than all other tributaries. With tears

Ferdinand of Austria Began for Protestant Help

in his eyes Ferdinand of Austria begged for help from the Protestants at

Begensburg. Suleiman marched through Hungary in 1542, capturing Valpo, Siclos, Fünfkirchen, Gran, Tata, and Stuhlweissenburg, while Ferdinand had only 4,000 men with which to oppose him.

Meanwhile Khairaddin Barbarossa had fruitlessly besieged Corfu in 1537, but had



THE HARBOUR AND TOWN OF RHODES AT THE END OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY
This ancient island fortress was besieged in vain by Sultan Bajazet in 1480; but when Suleiman came to the throne he soon avenged the defeat by taking Rhodes, after a defence of six months by the Knights of St. John, December, 1522.

as a fief of the Spanish crown. Charles V. contemplated the conquest of Algiers—captured in 1506 and 1509 by Ferdinand the Catholic with Oran and Bugia, but lost by Barbarossa to Horuk in 1515—and even Constantinople. But after the death of Zapolya, on July 21st, 1540,

Hungary as a Turkish Province

Suleiman made almost the whole of Hungary a Turkish province in September, 1541, and the expedition of

Charles to the African coast failed utterly, as a great storm either shattered his ships or drove them scattered upon the Spanish coast.

Francis I. loudly proclaimed his delight at the emperor's misfortune, congratulated the sultan on "the overthrow of their

conquered Naxos, Tinos, and Seriphos, as also Castelnuovo in Dalmatia in 1539, and had forced Venice, under an agreement of October 2nd, 1540, to cede Malvasia, Napoli di Romania, Nadin, and Urana. He now landed with the Turkish fleet at Reggio in Calabria, devastated the coast, joined the French fleet at Toulon, and won a victory at Nizza on August 20th, 1543, the last refuge of the Duke of Savoy.

At the same time Suleiman Pasha, the governor of Egypt, was spreading terror even to the Indian Ocean, where he conquered the Portuguese, captured the town of Diu, and subdued the Arab princes on the coast of the Red Sea. The years 1546-1547 saw the death of four of the most

powerful men of the period—Francis I., Henry VIII., Luther, and Khairaddin Barbarossa. Even in his tomb on the right bank of the Bosphorus at Beshik Tash this great sea hero was the example and the guiding star of his successors. After the victory of the old corsair chief ain over Andrea Doria at Prevéza in 1538, the war

Piratical Turks Sweep the Mediterranean

fleets and pirates of the Turks were masters of the Mediterranean. While Maurice of Saxony gave up the towns of Metz, Toul, and Verdun to Henry II. of France in 1552, King Ferdinand sent an embassy to the camp of Sultan Suleiman at Amasia in Asia Minor. Roger Ascham, the English ambassador of the time, says of the French king, that in order to do the emperor a mischief he was ready to sell his soul simultaneously to Protestants and Papists, to the Turk and to the devil. Though not inspired with the spirit of Machiavelli, yet well acquainted with the learning of the renaissance, Ferdinand's ambassador, Augier Ghiselin of Busbeck, set out for Amasia in 1555. Not only did he bring back from Persia documentary proof of an armistice with the "glorious and splendid" conqueror, but with this embassy is also connected the discovery of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, "the queen of inscriptions," near Busbeck in Angora, which led to a revival of interest in antiquities, paleography, epigraphy, and numismatics in the West. The same ambassador also brought the tulip bulb and the elder-tree to Europe.

Besides the four long Latin letters reporting upon his mission, he sent a despatch to the emperor containing a "proposal" as to "the possibility of waging a continued conflict with the hereditary enemy of the Christian name and blood, taking the field without dismay and securing victory." This pamphlet displays Turkish military discipline in the best and

Tragedies in Turkish Court of Splendour

German discipline in the worst possible light. But it also contains numerous suggestions for improvement. A century was to elapse before this seed could bear fruit. The Roman emperor of the German nation could not, as such, send emissaries to the Porte, since he swore in his coronation oath to wage eternal war with the infidels; it was possible for him only as king of Hungary to send ambassadors to the

Turk. A permanent German embassy could no more be maintained in Constantinople than a German colony.

Busbeck gives a full description of the court life and court splendour, and also of the horrible domestic tragedies which stained Suleiman's imperial purple with blood. For the love of his Russian consort Roxalana, Khurrem Sultana, the sultan sacrificed Mustafa, the first son of his first marriage in 1553, and Mustafa's little son, Ibrahim. Jehangir committed suicide upon his brother's corpse before his cruel father's eyes. As the younger brother Bajazet revolted against Selim II., Roxalana's eldest son, he was forced to flee to Persia in 1561. The sultan's myrmidons caught him at the Shah's court, and strangled him with his four sons.

In the summer of 1565 the Maltese order repulsed a strong Turkish attack. The better to secure the safety of the order, the grand master Jean Parisot de la Valette founded the town of Valetta in 1566, which was increased by later additions to a fortress of first-rate importance. But the campaign begun by the Emperor

Death of the Great Suleiman

Maximilian II. with 60,000 men came to a miserable end. In vain did the brave Zrinyi sacrifice himself in Szigetvar in 1566. After his heroic death this outpost fell on September 7th, and Gyula, the capital of the county of Beke, was lost with the surrounding territory.

But before the fall of Szigetvar the lion whose roar had long so affrighted Christianity had passed away on September 5th. Suleiman II. had brought the Ottoman Empire to the zenith of its power and splendour. At the same time Ismail had established the power of Persia by the consolidation of the state, Siegmund II. had secured Poland's greatness and prosperity, Ivan the Terrible had laid the foundation of Russian greatness by the conquest of Astrachan—three dangerous neighbours and contemporaries. But Suleiman the Magnificent undoubtedly takes precedence of these as a ruler both in war and peace. In his reign originated the proverb: "Treasures in Hindustan, wisdom in France, splendour in the house of Osman."

Under this greatest of all sultans a golden age began for Turkish scholarship and poetry. The lyric poet Baki made his appearance. Fazli wrote his allegorical mystical epic "Rose and Nightingale." Khalil was pre-eminent in elegiac poetry.



THE GALLANT SORTIE OF COUNT ZRINYI AGAINST THE TURKS DURING THE HEROIC DEFENCE OF SZIGETVAR IN 1566
Zrinyi made a heroic but unavailing stand against the Turks; and the last outpost of Maximilian's movement against Ottoman oppression fell to the conquering Turk after his death

HARMSWORTH HISTORY OF THE WORLD

Jelili, Fikri, Sururi who died in 1561, and especially the fertile Lamü, translated and expounded the masterpieces of Persian poetry. Emri, Chiali, and Yahia were their rivals. The fable and the animal epic came into fashion, as did the writers of historical epics *Shahnameji*; they were creators and defenders of fame. Sheikh Ibrahim Halebi composed the second legal code, *Mülteka ül Buhur*, a religious, political, and military code of civil and criminal law. The *Humayun nameh* (the emperors' book) of Ali Veissi (Ali i-Wasi) is an unsurpassed model of Turkish prose. Firdusi the Long, so called to avoid confusion with his great namesake, composed the *Suleiman nameh*, a collection of Eastern tales and legends. Famous, too, are the performances of the *Khattat*, that is, the calligraphists *Psherkef*, *Hasan Effendi*, and *Karahissar*. Sultan Suleiman himself left behind a "divan" under the name of *Muhibbi*—that is, the kindly lover. Under his rule sword and pen were never dry. Messages of victory alternated with songs, and intellectual rivalry outshone the trophies of captured weapons. This was the Augustan age of Ottoman history.

Everywhere greatness, power, and splendour, to which the treasures in the old Seraglio and the sultan's castles still bear testimony, a splendour which defied the sharpest introspection to discover the

germs of decay in the roots of the flourishing growth which bore these tropic blooms. As the calligraphy, the epistolary art, and the music of the Ottomans were based on Arab models, so in content the Ottoman poetry was a formal, intentional, voluntary work of imitation. It began with artificial forms of religious mysticism and didactic writing, and continued its existence as the hothouse growth of the atmosphere of court and chancery. Even the language affected by the poets was a special product, which was and remains unintelligible to the mass of the people.

The ideas of love and freedom appealed to no Ottoman poet; the passion of love remained with him a primarily sensual impulse; his imagination never awoke from that half-sleeping rapture which the Ottomans call *Keif*. Despotism above the restraints of right and morality, the cruel extermination of the prominent and therefore dangerous members of the dynasty and the court, seraglio education, the strict seclusion of the young princes from public life, polygamy, and slavery, destroyed the freedom of intellectual and political life, destroyed the power of the ruling dynasty and of the government. The bold warrior nation became indolent amid the sweets of peace; the fighting race of Janissaries became ever more lawless and a danger to the empire instead of a support.



A DEFEAT FOR THE AGGRESSIVE TURKS AT MALTA IN THE YEAR 1565
After exhausting every effort to reduce the place, held by the Knights of Malta, the Ottoman army withdrew defeated.



THE WANING OF THE CRESCENT THE MOSLEM WARS WITH CHRISTENDOM AND GRADUAL DECLINE OF TURKISH POWER

THE long and expensive war with Suleiman the Magnificent had utterly exhausted the imperial revenues of the Hapsburgs. In the year 1568 Maximilian II. was forced to consent to the payment of a yearly tribute of 60,000 ducats to Selim II. In spite of this, the devastating incursions of the "frontier guards" upon the Austrian territories continued, and from these, even in time of peace, the Turks carried off year by year as many as 20,000 Christian slaves. The boundary of the imperial hereditary lands, extending about 2,000 English miles with 21,000 men in 96 stations, absorbed 1,400,000 gulden annually in payment of service alone, and this amount was doubled in time of war.

On February 1st, 1570, Selim II. wrote to the Signoria of Venice, "I want Cyprus from you," and the Venetians, who were objects of suspicion to the powers themselves as "Christian Turks," could find no helper but the Pope. Pius V. issued a jubilee decree touching the Turkish war, and appealed to the Protestant princes to "cast away religious differences in the face of the universal danger"; he gave support to the Maltese, made Italy secure, and promoted an alliance between Hungary, France, and Spain. But Charles IX. of France had a short time previously renewed his treaty of peace and commerce with the sultan, and dissuaded even the

Inauguration of the Holy League Queen of England from supporting the movement for "help against the Turks." News soon reached Rome of the bloody overthrow of Nikosias in Cyprus on September 9th, 1570; Marcantonio Bragadino, who heroically defended Famagusta until August 1st, 1571, was flayed alive on August 18th by the order of Lala Mustafa. It was not until May 20th, 1571, that the Holy League was solemnly inaugurated.

Don John of Austria, the natural son of the Emperor Charles V., at length left Messina on September 19th, 1571, with a fleet of 208 ships and 80,000 soldiers from Spain, Venice, Malta and Savoy. A battle was fought in the Gulf of Lepanto, off the Curzolari Islands, on October 7th. The Kapudan Pasha

The Great Battle of Lepanto Muezzin Sade Ali, the Beglerbeg of Algiers, Uluj Ali, and the Beg of Negroponte, Mohammed Shaulak, commanded the Turkish fleet of 277 ships with 120,000 men, which still flew Khairaddin's victorious pennant. Don John, Marcantonio Colonna, Agostino Barbarigo and Sebastian Veniero, Gianandrea Doria and Alessandro Farnese, directed the battle on the Christian side, in which Cervantes lost his left arm. "This immortal day," he says in Don Quixote, "broke the pride of the Ottomans and undeceived the world, which regarded the Turkish fleet as invincible."

But the King of Spain's commands and dissensions among the allies nullified all the consequences of this shattering victory. Don John, the "man sent from God," as the triumphant Pope designated him, was obliged to surrender Goletta, which Charles V. had captured in 1535, together with Tunis and Biserta, his own captures of 1573, to the Turkish admiral, Sinan Pasha, in 1574. The Signoria of Venice, who had again concluded a special peace with the Turks at the price of Cyprus, true to its traditions, congratulated the sultan on his success of 1574. The Grand Vizir Sokolli, an old comrade-in-arms of Suleiman, scornfully thanked the Bailo of Venice with the words, "By the conquest of Cyprus we have cut off one of your arms; by the destruction of our fleet you have but shorn our beard." The continual diplomatic intercourse between the Porte and the West European

powers found expression in numerous commercial conventions: France and England in particular were eager and jealous rivals for the sultan's commercial favour, though they did not join him in alliance against Spain.

Selim survived the defeat of his fleet by only three years, and died on December 12th, 1574, exhausted by his excesses and his intemperance. His son Murad III. secured the throne (1574-1595) by the murder of his five brothers. The Popes Gregory XIII. (1572-1585) and Sixtus V. made fruitless attempts to promote a new general federation against the enemy of Christendom. Sixtus V., one of the greatest Popes, and a most far-sighted ruler, pondered the possibility of a conquest of Egypt, the construction of the Suez Canal to secure the trade of the Old World, the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre, and alliances with Persia, the Druses, Russia, and Poland. But the most powerful of the Christian powers of Europe were in alliance with the sultan. The counterpoise to Rome was to be found in the rooms of the Divan; it was as though the old relations between the papacy and Byzantium had been renewed.

The Emperor Rudolf II. was tributary to the Turks. Every year he was obliged, like his father before him, to send 130,000 gulden, with an infinite quantity of silver-work and watchmaker's work, to the sultan, to his wives, and the grandees of the Porte by way of homage. At the same time the breaches of the peace continued. In view of the

disturbed state of Hungary it would be wrong to conclude that the Turks were always the aggressors. In the great mili-

tary camp, which Hungary had been steadily forming for decades, breaches of the peace and of frontier rights on both sides were the order of the day. The imperial soldier fought with the same wild courage and ferocity as the Turk. We are upon the eve of the Thirty Years' War. To scalp the fallen after a victory, to impale them before the camp, to cover the scalp with hay or powder and set fire to it, were as usual as to plunder the dead, to outrage women, to break conditions on surrendering a fortress, and to commit every kind of treacherous surprise and betrayal. Yet on both sides were the same conviction of the fear of God and the

same piety. The noble and capable Grand Vizir Sokolli was murdered on October 11th, 1579, and was succeeded in


1580 by the Albanian Sinan, who had already distinguished himself, as governor of Egypt, by the conquest of Yemen in 1571 and of Goletta in 1574, though mutiny among the Janissaries had on two occasions obliged him to resign the great seal to his enemies and rivals, Ferhad and Siavush. On his elevation to the post of Grand Vizir for the third time, in 1593, he induced the peace-loving sultan to declare open war upon the emperor on August 13th. Sinan proposed to conquer Bohemia, while his vizirs began the war from Bosnia. At the head of 150,000 men he had captured Totis, or Tata, and conquered the important town of Raab



THE HERO OF LEPANTO
Don John of Austria, commander of the forces of Spain, Venice, Malta and Savoy, was described by the Pope as the "man sent from God."



A LEADER AT LEPANTO
Sebastiano Veniero was one of the Christian leaders acting with Don John. From a portrait by Tintoretto now at Vienna.



THE GREAT BATTLE OF LEPANTO, WHICH BROKE THE SEA POWER OF TURKEY

At the great naval battle of Lepanto in 1571 Don John of Austria led the European Christian allies against the Turks, and "this immortal day," says Cervantes, who lost his left arm in the fight, "broke the pride of the Ottomans and undeceived the world, which regarded the Turkish fleet as invincible." The Ottoman fleet consisted of 277 ships with 120,000 men.

From the painting by Verelsteyn in the Louvre, Paris, at Venice.

in 1594. On the death of Murad III., Mohammed III. (1595-1603), after strangling his nineteen brothers, marched in person to the "holy war"; but on August 13th, 1595, he was defeated with crushing loss at Kalugareni by Michael the Bold, the national hero of Wallachia. Accompanied, however, by his wise tutor, the mufti of Stamboul, and the court historiographer Sead ed-din, he conquered Erlau on October 13th, 1595.

"Drunkenness, the great curse of Germany," wrote the Lutheran theologian George Mylius from the camp, "has chiefly betrayed us into the hands of the temperate and watchful Turks." On October 20th, Kanizsa, the bulwark of Styria, sank into ruins. Siegmund Bathori, who had been independent ruler of Transylvania since 1588, had been attempting to break away from the Turkish federation since 1592; in 1597 and 1599 he

resigned the government, and was finally expelled from Transylvania by the Imperial troops in 1602. The peasants themselves considered the Turkish government more tolerable than the tyranny of the magnates, and were anxious for religious reasons to shake off the yoke of the ultra Catholic house of Hapsburg. In 1604 Stefan Bocskay concluded an alliance with the Turks, and was recognised as prince of Hungary and Transylvania in 1605. The commanding fortress of Gran had again fallen into the hands of the Turks in 1604.

Ultimately, on June 23rd, 1606, peace was made with the representatives of Bocskay at Vienna, and with the Turks at

Zsitva-Torok on November 11th. But under what conditions! The Turks were to retain all previous conquests and receive a yearly present of 200,000 gulden. Bocskay was recognised in Transylvania and in eight counties of Hungary during his lifetime. In a secret protestation the Emperor Rudolf II. affirmed that his signature had been extorted by necessity and was not binding for the future. He was forced to take this step by the Protestants in the empire and in Hungary, the fratricidal struggle in the house of


Hapsburg, bad harvests and a general rise in prices, and the incapacity and petty jealousy of his soldiers. That

heroic race had not yet grown up which was to proceed from the military school of Parma and Orange, and to enter the arena of Hungary equipped with masterly strategical skill and with an art of warfare and siege work which was made


infinitely superior to the Turks.

After the Peace of Zsitva-Torok in 1606 the Hapsburgs did not long remain tributary to the sultans; thenceforward the Turkish Empire gained no further accession of territory. The peace marks a halting point in the progress of Turkish power, the transition to impending decay; and on this depends its importance to the history of the world. It was not until 1616 that the corrections in the documents of the peace were presented by the

Austrian ambassador Von Czernin. He was the first Christian ambassador who entered Constantinople publicly with the banner of the Cross and accompanied by music.



TYPES OF VENETIAN GALLEYS USED IN THE GREAT BATTLE OF LEPANTO



THE MOSQUE OF THE SULTAN AHMED AND THE HIPPODROME AT STAMBOUL
This rich and beautiful monument, "like a vision of the air," commemorates an unprofitable reign of fourteen years.

Two circumstances saved the Holy Roman Empire from overthrow—internal disturbances and disputes concerning the succession in Turkey, and the strengthening of the military frontier. In 1603 the Persians took Tebriz and Bagdad from the sultan, and defeated more than 50,000 men in a pitched battle. The crescent was waning. "The breakwater of eastern and western migrations at the Golden Horn" still ruled, it is true, over a world extending from the Rif shores of Morocco to the Arabian seas, from the Gulf of Oman to the Don, and from the angle of the Danube at Waitzen to Georgia. But the Porte's powers had obviously flagged during the fifteen years' struggle from 1591 to 1606; Asiatic support was tottering, and enemies at home, more dangerous than the Persians or Egyptians, had undermined the army, the navy, and the supremacy of the theocratic sultanate. The Mohammedan Empire was founded upon no basis of national sentiment, and any nationalist movement was stifled by the doctrines of the Mohammedan religion. The decline of the Ottoman power dates from the outbreaks in the last quarter of the sixteenth

century, the revolts in the army, the frequent changes of personnel in the Grand Vizirship and all the higher posts of the empire; but the chief cause was to be found in the person of the sultan himself. The tyranny of the Grand Vizirs, the female government practised by the harem, the system of rapacious extortion practised by the Beglerbegs, "the sultan's sponges"—these are evils closely connected with the pusillanimity, fear, greed, and licentiousness of Murad III.



SULTAN MOHAMMED III.

An infirm old man while still young in years; he was so timorous that he trembled at the sound of the cannon. He reigned eight years.

His character was compounded of the strangest contradictions. In common with his contemporary, Rudolf II., he had not only a pacific disposition, but artistic and scientific inclinations. Evidence of his artistic and architectural taste may be seen in the numerous buildings, of which many were erected under the Grand Vizir Sinan, such as a new seraglio in Scutari, the mosques of Adrianople, Magnesia on the Sipylos, and Cyprus, in the great fortifications of Erivan, Kars, and Shamachi, and the drainage works of Mecca.

Even the accounts of his enemies praise his interest in music, legislation, and history. But as with Rudolf II. so with

HARMSWORTH HISTORY OF THE WORLD

him, the influence of favourites was predominant in every department of governmental administration.

At the age of thirty-three Mohammed III. (1595-1603) was already a sick and infirm old man. For the first time since the foundation of the empire a Padishah was seen upon the throne who trembled even at the thunder of the cannon, whereas his predecessors had appeared daily before the troops and had been accustomed to practise archery and throwing the jereed in the Okmeidan. Ahmed I. (1603-1617) followed his father's example: he was licentious, incapable, and proud to the point of insanity. Ahmed died on November 22nd, 1617, after an unprofitable reign of fourteen years. His memory

is perpetuated by a great and beautiful monument, the Ahmed Mosque, with its six minarets, on the Atmeidan in Stamboul. The mosque is a huge, yet light and delicate, building, like a vision of the air, with a dome supported on four enormous marble pillars, while the interior could contain four small mosques. The six minarets were regarded as an infraction of the dignity of the central shrine of Moham-medanism, the Kaaba of Mecca, and the sultan was forced to add a seventh praying tower to the Haram of the Kaaba to restore its prestige and appease the suspicions of the orthodox.

Ahmed left seven sons, the eldest, Osman, being but twelve years of age.

Mustafa I. (1617-1618), the brother of the deceased sultan, therefore succeeded to the throne. He, however, was insane, and the body of the Ulemas, Muftis, and the Divan, resolved upon the unprecedented step of deposing the sultan and confining him to a tower

of the old seraglio. Notwithstanding his minority, Osman II. (1618-1622) was placed upon the throne. At the age of fourteen he shook off the guardianship of his vizirs, executed his younger and more talented brother, and undertook a war

against the Poles in the forests and steppes of Khotin. His Janissaries were conquered, and when he attempted to punish them by extermination, they confined him also in the Castle of the Seven Towers, where he was strangled by Daud Pasha in May, 1622. The mad Mustafa was brought out of his prison, and under his rule the provinces of Georgia, Erivan, Bagdad, and Basra were again lost to the Persians in 1622.

Mustafa I. was once more deposed, and Murad IV.

(1623-1640), a younger brother of Osman II., was placed upon the throne. In the year 1620 Gabriel Bethlen had already attempted to secure recognition as King of Hungary by sending rich presents to the Porte through Franz Balassy, Stefan Korlath, and even by an embassy of the "winter king," Frederic V. of the Palatinate. The price of this recognition was

Waitzen, which fell into the hands of the Pasha of Ofen on November 5th, 1621. The Sultana Validé Kassamu Mahpeiker governed during the minority of her grandson Murad IV; to her Stamboul owes its largest and finest caravanserai, the Validé Han.

At the same time Mohammed Girai III., the

khan of the Crimean Tartars, destroyed the Turkish fleet; the Cossacks plundered Böyük-dere on the Bosphorus; Abasa, the Pasha of Erzeroum, revolted, and the advance of Wallenstein, in 1626, against Mansfeld and Bethlen forced the Turks



MUSTAFA I.

Found to be insane, this sultan was deposed and kept in confinement.



SULTANS IBRAHIM AND MOHAMMED IV.

The arrogance and caprice of Sultan Ibrahim resulted in his deposition and murder; while Mohammed IV., his son, began to reign just when Germany was rising after the devastating Thirty Years War.

THE WANING OF THE CRESCENT

to raise the siege of Neograd. In 1634 George I. Rakoczy, the successor of Bethlen, who died on November 15th, 1629, hesitated to join the sultan in an attack upon the Poles. The sultan then gave his support to one Szekely and to Stefan Bethlen, the brother of Gabriel, whose claims were also urged by the ambassadors of France and Holland. Meanwhile the cruel Murad had conquered Tebriz and Erivan in a vigorous campaign in 1634, had murdered his brothers Bajazet and Suleiman, and recaptured Bagdad, four years later, in 1638.

The imperial Christian government pursued the task of resistance with remarkable energy by the slow but sure creation of a military frontier, which was to secure their ultimate victory. Matthias Corvinus and Ferdinand I. had already begun the work; but it was not until the time of Maximilian II. that this line of fortresses, extending about one thousand English miles from Transylvania to Dalmatia, was definitely secured. The Archduke Charles was appointed "permanent residential governor of the Croatian and Wendish frontier lands." After the fall of Belgrade, in 1521, the stream of "Uskokes," Servian and Bosnian fugitives, began to pour into Austrian territory. Ferdinand I. had granted them numerous privileges and immunity from taxation in 1535, and had settled them in the Karst deserts of the Sichelburg district, the modern Uskoke Mountains. They were followed by a steady stream of refugees, who were ready and willing to serve in the local levies as cavalry and infantry.

From this material the Austrian rulers created that militia to guard the Danube and the Save which for two centuries acted as a bulwark against the Turkish assaults. The bravest of them and the scourge of Turkey were the Zeng Uskokes of the maritime frontier. For more than a century they were the terror of Adria, and inflicted the most serious loss both upon the maritime power of Venice and the continental power of Turkey. Piracy was carried on throughout the Mediterranean by the Barbary states—Algiers,

Tunis, and Tripoli—by the Maltese, the Sicilians, and the Neapolitans. But the Zeng Uskokes were the pirate kings of Adria, and from their impregnable fortress of Zeng on the sheltering Quarnero, the home of the terrible Bora, their bold expeditions went forth even to the shores of Persia.

Murad, the Ottoman Nero, who, like Nero, was passionately devoted to music, was succeeded by his brother Ibrahim I. (1640-1648), the Ottoman Heliogabalus. His arrogance and threatening caprice drove the

Ulemas, the scribes, and lawyers to contract an alliance with the Janissaries in their mosque of Ortajami. Ibrahim was the first sultan to be deposed and murdered under an apparently constitutional form of procedure on August 18th, 1648.

His son, Mohammed IV. (1648-1687), ascended the throne in the year in which Germany began to rise from the devastation of the Thirty Years' War. It was fortunate for the Holy Roman Empire that, during this decade, a succession of feeble sultans, wars with the Persians, and



THE BEAUTIFUL VALIDE MOSQUE AT STAMBOUL
Fifty years were occupied in erecting this place of worship. It was begun in 1615 by the wife of Sultan Ahmed I., and completed in 1665.

internal disturbances, had weakened the strength that repeatedly threatened the destruction of Christendom. The struggle for the guardianship of the sultan, who was but ten, or perhaps even seven, years of age, resulted, in 1651, in the death of the mother of three sultans, the beautiful Greek slave Tarkhan, and brought the empire to the verge of dis-

**Sultan Mohammed
Beheads Thirty
of his Councillors**

solution. An attempt was made to relieve the hopeless financial embarrassment by tripling the state taxes and debasing the coinage. At the beginning of 1656 crowds of peasants appeared from Anatolia to complain of the unprecedented extortion practised by their governor. The name "Runjiber"—that is, full of woe—clung to them henceforth as a memorial of the continuous oppression under which they groaned. Mutinies among the Janissaries and revolts of vizirs increased: to appease the mutinous guards, who marched to the Seraglio, Mohammed IV. sacrificed thirty of his councillors, whose heads were suspended from the famous plane-tree on the Etmeidan. Francesco Morosini conquered Lemnos and Tenedos, while Lorenzo Marcello destroyed seventy Turkish sailing-vessels at the entrance to the Dardanelles.

The saviour was at hand. Mohammed Kuprili became Grand Vizir in September, 1656. An Albanian peasant boy, he had come to Stamboul, and though he could neither read nor write, his keen intelligence and his strong will had raised him to the highest position in the empire. Kuprili crushed the revolt in the blood of 30,000 victims; he took as his model Murad IV., the pupil of Machiavelli. He destroyed the Venetian fleet of Lazzaro Mocenigo, recaptured Lemnos and Tenedos in 1657, conquered the castles of the Dardanelles, in 1657-1658 defeated the troops of George II. Rakoczy, who had made himself independent, and appointed Achatius Barcsay prince of the country with an

**Human Heads
Decorate the
Seraglio Walls**

increased tribute of 40,000 ducats. He drove the Cossacks across the Dnieper, caused thirty pashas of Asia Minor and Syria to be massacred in a treacherous ambush at Aleppo in the spring of 1659, and placed cartloads of heads on the Seraglio walls as a warning. He even ventured to repress the insane extravagance of the Seraglio and the harem. His only failure was his enterprise against Crete, Cardinal Mazarin having sent relief

to the Venetians, who were hard pressed in that island. Kuprili retorted by immediately imprisoning the French ambassador Jacques de la Haye in 1658, and treated the threats of Louis XIV. with contempt.

Kuprili died on November 1st, 1661, at the age of eighty. Mohammed IV. paid him a visit on his death-bed, and promised that his son Ahmed Kuprili should succeed him in the office of Grand Vizir, a measure unprecedented in the history of this high office. Ahmed was highly educated, and possessed a thorough knowledge of the Koran, the Sunna, and Mohammedan science in general. His experience had been acquired as Pasha of Erzeroum and Damascus, and as Kaim-makam of Stamboul, and he became Grand Vizir at the age of twenty-seven. The sultan was then twenty-three years old, absorbed in luxury, the chase, in youths and afterwards in women, and was resident in Adrianople. In 1662 Leopold's troops had seized Serimvar in Transylvania; Ahmed attacked them in the spring of 1663. In spite of the fact that the soldiers' pay was stinted by the avaricious sultan, he succeeded in capturing

**"Powdered and
Perfumed Frenchmen"
Fight the Turks**

Neuhäusel, Ujivar, Serimvar, and Gran. However, on August 1st, 1664, he was defeated at Sankt Gotthard, a monastery on the Raab. This battle marks a turning point in Turkish military history. The Austrians and Hungarians were co-operating with 6,000 French under Count Jean Coligny and François d'Aubusson, Vicomte de la Feuillade, with the flower of the French nobility. The Grand Vizir regarded the powdered and perfumed Frenchmen with their bright uniforms as girls. The army was under the leadership of Raymond, Count Montecuccoli, the Austrian field-marshal. Before the battle the cavalry general Johann von Sporck bared his head and prayed: "Almighty God, our General on high, if Thou wilt not help us, Thy Christian children, yet help not these Turkish dogs, and Thou shalt see somewhat to Thy delight."

Coligny's French then charged the hostile ranks with the awful war-cry "Tuez!" and the small-arm volley firing here secured its first triumph. The chapel of Sankt Gotthard, built in commemoration of the destruction of the Turkish army, is still to be seen. Jealousy and mistrust, as usual, made it impossible to reap the

THE WANING

full advantage of the Christian victory. In the peace of Vasvar, on August 10th, 1664, the Porte retained the fortresses of Serimvar and Ujvar. But a great moral effect was produced; the Sanjak-i-shereef, the banner of the Prophet, which had been unfurled in vain on August 13th, 1595, had suffered another overthrow.

Ahmed Kuprili was obliged to seek compensation in the conquest of Crete. At ten o'clock in the morning of September 27th, 1669, the Proveditore Morosini handed to the Grand Vizir the keys of Candia, which the Venetians had held for 465 years. The French relieving force, under the Duke Anne Jules de Noailles and François de Vendôme, was as ineffective as the fleet of Pope Clement IX. Naintel, the French ambassador, renewed the capitulations of Francis I. with the Porte on June 3rd, 1673. According to these, special rights were reserved or confirmed to the French ambassadors—French goods, the East India trade, the Catholics in Turkey, the ecclesiastical buildings, the French in Pera and Galata, and the Holy Places.

Some time previously Francis Bacon and Hermann Conring had published suggestions for the solution of the Eastern question. These ideas were reopened by G. W. Leibnitz in 1670 and 1671 in his comprehensive memorial: "De propositione Egyptiaca," which he presented in person to the Most Christian King in Paris. His proposals involved nothing less than the conquest of Egypt and the cutting of the Suez Canal. A French diplomat ironically observed of the memoir: "Mais vous savez que les projets d'une guerre sainte ont cessé d'être à la mode depuis Saint Louis."

The place of the powers hitherto predominant is now taken by two new states in hostility to the crescent—Poland and Russia. The Porte had confirmed the revolted Cossack Hetman of the Ukraine, Doroschenko, in the position of Sanjak Bey, or governor, as though he were dealing with a Turkish province. Poland raised a justifiable objection which ended in war. In the early autumn of 1672

Mohammed IV. and Ahmed Kuprili ravaged Poland with 150,000 men as far as Kamenéz, Lemberg, and Lublin, and forced the feeble King Michael Koribut Wisniowiecki to cede Podolia and the

Ukraine in the peace of Bucsacs on September 18th, 1672. But in the following year

the crown field-marshal John Sobieski defeated the Grand Vizir and the Seraskier Hussein Pasha on the plain of Khotin (November 10-11th, 1673), and captured the green banner, which still hangs in St. Peter's at Rome. In 1674-1675 Sobieski, who was now King John III., captured the towns of Hunan and Lemberg and utterly defeated Kara Mustafa, the brother-in-law of Kuprili. Doroschenko threw himself into the arms of the Russians. The Tsar Feodor III. of Moscow,

against whom the holy war was declared, came off victorious in three successive campaigns, 1677-1679. Ahmed Kuprili had previously died at the beginning of November, 1676.

In the peace of Radzyn, February 11th, 1681, the Poles obtained portions of the Ukraine and Podolia, which had already been of necessity returned to them in the peace of Zuravna, concluded on October 27th, 1676, between Sobieski and Ibrahim Sheitan; while the Russians again obtained access to a port on the Black Sea by the cession of the Laporog Cossacks. With this year begins the insidious influence of Russia upon Turkey.

The pathway to this goal could be engineered only by the triumph and the blood of Austria. On August 10th, 1683, the Porte at the instigation of Louis XIV. had appointed the rebel Count Emerich Tököly, to whom the King of France had sent one De Ferriol as ambassador, as King of Hungary, with influence extending over territory belonging to Austria. War was thus rendered inevitable. Prince Eugene of Savoy afterwards declared in his memoirs: "Had it not been for Louis XIV., the Moslems and the revolted Hungarians would never have reached the gates of Vienna." The arrogant and ignorant Kara Mustafa, who acted as Seraskier and Sirdar, with unlimited power, had dreams of founding



A FAMOUS GRAND VIZIR

The Grand Vizir, Ahmed Kuprili, who, with Mohammed IV., ravaged Poland in 1672, died early in 1676.

**Poland Ravaged
by an Army of
150,000 Men**

a second Turkish Empire, of which he was to be the ruler, with Vienna as his capital. The Emperor Leopold I. fled to Linz. On March 31st, 1683, Pope Innocent II. brought about an alliance between the emperor and Poland. Charles of Lorraine, with 40,000 men, had been enabled to prevent the Turks from crossing the Raab, and was waiting behind the Kahlenberg, anxiously expecting the help of the empire and of the Poles, while Count Rüdiger of Starhemberg established him-

of the town. It was not until all danger was past that the emperor returned.

The Turks fled from Germany for ever, abandoning inestimable treasure. Sobieski, with Charles of Lorraine, pursued and defeated them at Parkany, and captured Gran. Kara Mustafa fled to Belgrade, where he was strangled by the sultan's orders on December 25th. In 1684 the imperial troops won a series of victories at Wissegrad, Waitzen, Pesth, and Hamzsabeg over Suleiman Pasha. Count Leslie

made a victorious advance into Bosnia. The age of Ottoman triumphs had passed; on August 19th Neuhausel was stormed and captured. But the greatest event of this campaign was the siege and the fall of Ofen on September 2nd, 1686, an exploit which saved some portion of the library of the Corvini. The German Emperor's field-marshal Charles of Lorraine, supported by the German elector Maximilian Emanuel, and by troops from Bavaria, Saxony and Brandenburg, had forced from the hands



MUSTAFA II. : A VICTIM OF THE JANISSARIES

This unhappy sultan, who ruled from 1695 till 1703, was deposed in favour of his brother, Ahmed III., and was done to death in the Seraglio.

approach of the relieving army, which had gathered at Tulln, on the Danube. In conjunction with Charles of Lorraine, and John George of Saxony, Max Emanuel of Bavaria, and George Frederic of Waldeck, John III. of Poland gathered his army of seventy thousand men, and made the Kahlenberg his base at the outset of the battle, which ended on September 12th in a total defeat of the Turks. On September 13th he made his entry into Vienna, and was greeted as the liberator

of the infidels the most important Turkish outpost, the capital city of the realm of St. Stephen, and also the remainder of those territories. Thus the freedom of the Magyars was by no means due to the bravery of that proud and warlike nation. On August 12th, 1687, the indefatigable Charles defeated 60,000 troops of Suleiman Pasha in the battle of Mohacs, and thus avenged the victory which Suleiman II. had gained there in 1526. The high expectations which were

THE WANING OF THE CRESCENT

excited by the Austrian victories and the simultaneous successes of the Venetians in the Morea are displayed in the pamphlet of the year 1687: "The Triumphant Imperial Eagle"; it was already reported that the sultan would have to transfer his capital to Cairo, Damascus, or Aleppo. In 1688 Transylvania also gave in her submission to the Emperor and King of Hungary, and secured full toleration for the four Christian religious communities that were recognised in the country. In this same year the Turkish Empire suffered severely from a famine and from conflagrations.

In 1685 the Poles had advanced to Jassy and were defeated at Bojan. All the more meritorious were the victories of the Venetians in the Morea under the defender of Candia, the capable general Francesco Morosini. They drove the Turks out of Dalmatia, conquered Santa Maura, Prevéza, Arta, Corinth, Argos, Patras, Koron, Modon, Navarino, Napoli di Romania, and Malvasia. The banner of Saint Mark flew once again in Greece, and in the Palace of the Doges the grateful senate erected a triumphal arch to "Morosini the Peloponnesian." It must be said that during the siege of Athens the Venetians inflicted great damage upon the immortal Parthenon. The powder explosion which was caused in the Parthenon by a shell from the batteries of the Venetian general, on September 26th, 1687, at seven o'clock in the evening completed the destruction of this ancient sanctuary of Pallas Athene, the Madonna, and the Panagia.

The liberation of Greece, the unbroken dream of European Philhellenes, and the event for which the oppressed Greeks yearned, had never been so near realisation since the fall of Constantinople and Athens. For Athens, however, the interval of freedom lasted only until April 9th, 1689, when Morosini, who had been

appointed Doge, gave up the town, which he found untenable. From Porto Leone (the Piræus) he carried off in safety the Athenian lions, which stand to-day

before the Arsenal of Venice as memorials of the abortive attempt at liberation, and of the pillaging of Athenian art treasures, and form a counter-piece to the bronze horses upon the portal of San Marco, which were taken from the sack of Constantinople in 1204. For three years the town of Pallas was abandoned by its inhabitants, until the sultan allowed the Athenians to return in 1690.

This series of misfortunes led to conspiracies among the Janissaries and Ulemas and to the deposition of the sultan, who was imprisoned in the Seraglio, where he died forgotten five years later. The conspirators passed over the sons of Mohammed IV., Mustafa, who was twenty-three years old, and Ahmed, who was fourteen, and appointed his brother Suleiman III. (1687-1691) as sultan. The Germans continued their conquests under the Margrave Ludwig Wilhelm of Baden, and captured Lippa, Illok, Peterwardein, and Erlau. On August 11th, 1688, Belgrade was surrounded by the elector Max Emanuel of Bavaria, with 53,000 troops from the empire and imperial provinces, and stormed on September 6th; it was, however, recaptured on October 18th, 1690, by the Grand Vizir Mustafa Kuprili. Charles of Lorraine was fighting on the Rhine; this brilliant leader would no doubt have advanced upon Constantinople after the fall of Belgrade, true to his motto, "aut nunc aut nunquam."

Mustafa Kuprili, known as Fazil, the virtuous, was now the one support of the tottering empire. In the new ordinance, the "Nisam Jedid," he issued orders for Christian toleration, renewed in 1690 the capitulations of 1673 with the Marquis de Chateaufeuf, the ambassador of Louis XIV., and after the victory of Tököly at Zernesht



AN AMBITIOUS SIRDAR
Kara Mustafa dreamed of ruling a second Turkish Empire, but was strangled by the sultan's orders.

the Morea under the defender of Candia, the capable general Francesco Morosini. They drove the Turks out of Dalmatia, conquered Santa Maura, Prevéza, Arta, Corinth, Argos, Patras, Koron, Modon, Navarino, Napoli di Romania, and Malvasia. The banner of Saint Mark flew once again in Greece, and in the Palace of the Doges the grateful senate erected a triumphal arch to "Morosini the Peloponnesian." It must be said that during the siege of Athens the Venetians inflicted great damage upon the immortal Parthenon. The powder explosion which was caused in the Parthenon by a shell from the batteries of the Venetian general, on September 26th, 1687, at seven o'clock in the evening completed the destruction of this ancient sanctuary of Pallas Athene, the Madonna, and the Panagia.



AHMED III.
He succeeded his brother on the throne, and, after being summarily deposed, died of poison in 1730.

toleration, renewed in 1690 the capitulations of 1673 with the Marquis de Chateaufeuf, the ambassador of Louis XIV., and after the victory of Tököly at Zernesht

over Generals Häusler and Doria, he successfully renewed the war with the conquest of Nissa, Widdin, Semendria, and Belgrade.

On July 23rd, 1691, Suleiman III. died, and was succeeded by his brother Ahmed II. (1691-1695). The Grand Vizir, in whose army 300 French officers were serving, was

French Officers utterly defeated on August
Fight for 19th at Slankamen, not far
the Grand Vizir from Peterwardein, by the

Margrave of Baden (the "Turkish Louis") and the Brandenburg general Hans Albrecht von Barfus; with him perished on the field of battle thirteen pashas, many officers, and 20,000 men. The Germans also suffered severe losses. After the death of Ahmed II., on February 6th, 1695, and the accession of Mustafa II. (1695-1703) the Kapudan Pasha, Hussein Pasha, "Mezzo Morto," recaptured Chios from the Venetians on February 18th. Mustafa in person defeated the bold Count Friederich von Veterani-Mallentheim at Lugos on September 22nd, and took Lipa, while Peter the Great of Russia forced Azov to surrender in July, 1696.

On July 5th, 1697, Prince Eugene of Savoy was appointed commander-in-chief of the whole of the imperial army. On July 24th the prince, who was thirty-four years of age, took the field; he had already won his spurs before the walls of Vienna, and from that moment the fortunes of the Turks deserted them. After pacifying a revolt in Upper Hungary, he followed the sultan by forced marches to Zenta; when the sun set upon September 2nd, 20,000 Turks lay dead upon the battlefield, and 10,000 in the Theiss; only 2,000 escaped. The sultan was obliged to watch the destruction of his army from the opposite bank of the river; he fled to Temesvar and retired across the Danube. Making Transylvania his base of operations, Count Roger of Bussy-Rabutin made an incursion at that moment,

The Peace of with 30,000 cavalry, into the
Carlowitz Banat and recaptured Uipalanka on the Danube. The
and its Results results, however, of the peace

of Ryswick, and of the battle of Zenta, could not be utilised to the full, as the emperor was obliged to carry on war in four different places at one and the same time. Moreover, the Austrian war ministry was utterly exhausted. After more than three months of negotiations which were spent in breaking down the resistance of Poland and

Russia to the intervention of the sea powers, Holland and England, and in overthrowing the influence of the French ambassador in Stamboul, the peace of Carlowitz, on the Danube, was concluded on January 26th, 1699.

This peace gave the emperor Transylvania and most of Hungary, and to the King of Poland, Kamenez; the Venetian Republic secured the Morea, without Lepanto, while Ragusa was embodied in the Turkish Empire. The chief result, however, of the peace was to place diplomatic relations between the emperor and the sultan upon a basis that corresponded to the dignity of the former. The emperor was now in a position to secure the solidarity of the Hungarian territories, though unfortunately his administrative capacities were not equal to the task. Revolts on the part of the magnates Franz Rakoczy, Anton Esterhazy-Forchtenstein, Alexander Karoly, and others, and of the evangelical population, repeatedly endangered the position of this dearly-acquired province.

Mustafa II. retired to Adrianople. The Grand Vizir Hussein Kuprili employed the peace of Carlowitz for the introduction of opportune reforms; but his premature death in 1703 deprived the empire of his services. His successor Mustafa Daltaban, showed great cruelty to the Catholic Armenians. He, together with the Grand Mufti Feisullah, was sacrificed to the Janissaries, who then dethroned the sultan, and set up his brother, Ahmed III. (1703-1730), under the condition that he should transfer his residence back to Constantinople. Mustafa II. was confined in the Seraglio, where he was poisoned four months after his deposition. Like his predecessors, Ahmed devoted himself personally to the art of poetry.

The most important event in his government was the arrival at Bender of the Swedish king Charles XII., who had been defeated at Pultowa in 1709 by the Russians. The Grand Vizir Ali Chorli had promised him the help of the khan of the Crim Tartars, and thus induced him to enter the Ukraine, in spite of the Russian superiority. The Grand Vizir was prevented from fulfilling his promise by his deposition. "Charles Ironhead" (demirbash), as the Turks called him, placed 1,000 men at Czernovitz on the border of Moldavia to keep watch upon the Russians, and with his

THE WANING OF THE CRESCENT

faithful friend, Stanislaus Poniatoffsky, induced the Turks to declare war against Russia on November 21st, 1710. He had already begun secret negotiations with the Greek subjects of the sultan. At Kush on the Pruth the Grand Vizir Baltaji Mohammed defeated the 30,000 men of the Tsar Peter, with a force three times as great; but the Tsarina Catharine succeeded in securing freedom and favourable conditions of peace on July 21st and 22nd, 1711, by bribing Osman Aga, and the Grand Vizir. After this the Tsar gave up his claims to Azov and its territory. After an adventurous journey through Central Europe, the Swedish king returned from Demotika to Stralsund in November, 1714.

Thanks to the treacherous Greeks, who preferred the Ottoman yoke to the Catholic government, the Grand Vizir Damad Ali was enabled, in 1715, to recover the Morea from the Venetians, who had grown effeminate in the luxurious life of their palaces, and did nothing to secure their precious possession. The emperor and Pope found an occasion for alliance in the "Holy Federation" of 1697. Their united fleet traversed the Archipelago under

The Fleet of the "Holy Federation" the papal flag. On August 19, 1717, Corfu was freed from the Turkish besieging forces by the bold resistance of the Venetian general Johann Matthias, Count of Schulenburg; his marble statue in Corfu, erected in 1718 by the Venetian Senate, bears the fine inscription: "Adhuc viventi." Prince Eugene insisted upon carrying out the terms of the treaty, and gathered an army at Futak near Peterwardein. On August 5th, in conjunction with Prince Alexander of Würtemberg, he won the battle of Peterwardein, "the Hungarian Gibraltar," in which the Grand Vizir Ali Kamurjich was slain. Pope Clement XI. sent the prince a consecrated sword and hat. The Banat was conquered by Claudius Florimund Count Mercy, and Temesvar fell on November 13th. Eugene decisively rejected an attempt at intervention on the part of the sea powers, and turned upon Belgrade. The bombardment of the island town began on July 23rd, when the Turkish army approached from Semendria. The imperial troops had been increased by six infantry battalions from the electorate of Bavaria and a dragoon regiment. The Bavarian princes, Charles Albert and Ferdinand, were before the walls on which their father

had performed his most brilliant feat of arms in 1688. On August 17th, Prince Ferdinand Albert II. of Brunswick-Bevern began the assault and the battle; Belgrade, with a garrison of 25,000 men, surrendered on the following day. The fame of the "noble knight" was in all men's mouths. In the spring of 1715 negotiations for peace

Christian Powers Attempt to Weaken Rome were begun at Passarovitz, on the Danube. The Christian powers which had formerly made such feeble efforts to crush the enemy of Christendom now displayed great anxiety to diminish the strength of the Holy Roman Empire. Eugene determined to make a military demonstration towards Nish and far into Bosnia. On July 21st the convention was concluded. The Porte gave up the Banat, with Temesvar, Belgrade, and a strip of territory running to the south of the Save. The jurisdiction of the imperial consuls over subjects of the Roman Empire resident in the Turkish Empire was confirmed in a commercial treaty.

Between 1722 and 1724 a protracted struggle broke out between the Turks and the Safevi Shahs, Hosein and Tamasp, of Persia, which brought some advantage to the Russians by the conquest of Daghestan and other provinces on the Caspian Sea; it resulted, on September 7th, 1730, in the deposition of Ahmed III., who had vainly sacrificed to the demand of the Janissaries the Grand Vizir Damad Ibrahim, the Kapudan Pasha, and the Kyaya-beg, or minister for domestic affairs. Ahmed died in 1736 of poison, after which war again broke out between Russia and Turkey.

Mahmud I. (1730-1754), a nephew of Ahmed, was a learned prince, devoted to luxury, science, and fine architecture. He enriched Stamboul with four libraries, a mosque, several fountains, and eight summer-houses on the banks of the Bosphorus, punished drunkenness severely, and induced the Moslems to exchange the wine-beaker for the coffee-cup. He exercised great severity against the libertine manners of the women. He displayed a stern fanaticism in opposing the movement of the reformer Mohammed Abd el-Wahhab and of the Wahhabites in Arabia in 1745, and decorated the Kaaba at Mecca with extravagant splendour. He allowed the Janissaries to exercise unlimited influence upon all affairs of state.

However, under his government the kingdom reached a further height of prosperity. The campaign of the Turks against the Austrians and Russians ended in the defeat of the Austrians at Krocza on July 23rd, 1739; this led to the peace of Belgrade on September 18th. The death of Prince Eugene, on April 21st, 1736, was

Russia's Strong Position on the Baltic

a loss severely felt. The imperial generals endangered all success by their mutual jealousies, and were forced to retire from Servia and Bosnia, beyond the Save and Danube. They, therefore, accepted the proposals formulated by the French diplomatist Villeneuve, which implied the cession of Belgrade, Orsova, Lesser Wallachia, and Bosnia. Austria's Eastern policy was checked at this boundary for a long period. Russia, however, which had gained a firm footing on the Baltic since the northern war, began to entertain hopes of entering upon her inheritance. For the moment, however, she was forced to content herself with Azov, on the Black Sea, which she had captured on July 1st, 1736, on her first devastation of the Crimea, and to resign her other conquests.

Turkish politics had never been in such close connection with those of Europe in general as in the reign of Mahmud I., the Solomon of the Golden Horn. Diplomats of every country thronged to his court, and rivalled one another in their efforts to secure the favour of the Grand Turk and of his vizirs, and to conclude favourable commercial treaties. The greatest influence was possessed by the French ambassadors such as Villeneuve, Castellane, and Desailleurs, who renewed and increased the old capitulations in 1740. The success of the Turkish army in the campaigns of 1737-1739 was apparently due to the prudent counsels of the French renegade Bonneval ("Ahmed Pasha," 1675-1747). In 1747 Louis XV.

Turkish Pride at its Zenith

sent the sultan many splendid presents, and twenty-two artillerists to work his new guns. In 1748 the Sublime Porte offered to act for the king as mediator at the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle; Turkish pride had thus reached its zenith. The Turkish historian Izzi relates the conclusion of the peace with the words: "God gave the dog power over the swine."

Osman III. (1754-1757), a brother of Mahmud I., who died on September 13th,

1754, was fifty-four years of age when he emerged from prison, an embittered and hardened character. During his reign the post of Grand Vizir changed hands fifteen times. The eldest son of Ahmed III., Prince Mohammed Khan, on whom high hopes were set, died before his father. Hence, on the death of the sultan the succession went to the second son of Ahmed, Mustafa III. (1754-1773). His reign was distinguished by the Grand Vizirship of Raghib Mohammed, who gave new vigour to the empire, and also won considerable reputation as an author. In 1747 he routed the Mameluke Beys in Cairo, and on March 23rd, 1761, he concluded a treaty for maritime commerce, trade, and friendship with Frederick the Great of Prussia, the sole object of which was to deprive the Austrians of the fruits of Carlowitz and Poscharewitz.

The Polish question brought about a fresh war between the Porte and Russia. On October 6th, 1769, the Grand Vizir Hamsa confined the Russian ambassador Obryesoff in the Castle of the Seven Towers. The khan of the Nogish Crimean Tartars, Krin Giray, entered the Russian

Sultan's Short Way with Defeated Generals

provinces on the Dnieper and Dniester, though his death, in March, 1769, freed Russia from this enemy. Mustafa III. had already adopted the name of Ghazi, the victorious. The sultan beheaded both the Grand Vizir Mohammed Emin, and also the Voivode of Moldavia, Kallimachi, for their ill success against the Russians under Alexander Golizyn and Peter Romanzoff at Pruth. Khalil Pasha suffered defeat in 1770 at Giurgevo, Bucharest, and Slatina.

Meanwhile, the Russian fleet, under Spiridoff and Elphinstone, had sailed from the Baltic to the Archipelago, and landed troops at Vitylo in the Morea. Orloff had defeated a Turkish fleet on July 6th in the roadstead of Krini at Chios, and burnt it. Further, the Christians of Montenegro, the Mainots, and other Greeks of the Morea, especially in Kalamata, revolted in numbers under the leadership of Russian officers. But the hour of liberation had not yet struck. The Russian fleet could not force the passage of the Dardanelles, which had been fortified by the Hungarian-Frenchman Baron Franz Tott (1733-1793); the Greek revolt was suppressed with great slaughter with the

THE WANING OF THE CRESCENT

help of the Albanians, enlisted by the Porte. The Albanians inflicted terrible devastation upon Greece, until the Porte was forced to take measures against them; but it was not until 1779 that they were almost destroyed by Hassan Pasha at Tripolitsa. Romanzoff, however, captured Kartal, Bender, and Braila.

Mustafa III. died on December 24th, 1773; as his son Selim (III.) was but twelve years old, Mustafa's brother Abdul Hamid I. (1774-1789) ascended the tottering throne. On July 21st, 1774, at Kutchuk-Kainarje, four hours from Silistria, that peace was concluded which Thugut has named the masterpiece of Russian diplomacy. Russia obtained a kind of protectorate over Moldavia and Wallachia and the Greek Christians in Turkey; so, at any rate, an article in this convention referring to Pera and Jerusalem was afterwards interpreted by the Russians. Further advantages were certain stations in the Crimea, and free passage in the Black and Ægean Seas.

Peace was not, however, concluded "for all time." As early as 1783, Grigori Potemkin again invaded the Crimea, seized the peninsula of Taman, drove out the Tartar khan, Shahin Giray, and incorporated this country and the Kuban territories in the Russian Empire as the provinces of Tauria and Caucasias. Joseph II. had come to a meeting in April, 1780, with the Tsarina Catharine II. in Mohileff, and had forced the sultan to give way by threats of war. In May, 1787, followed the memorable meeting of the rulers in Kherson, where Potemkin inscribed upon the southern gate the boastful inscription: "This way to Byzantium." On August 16th, the Grand Vizir anticipated a revolt of the Janissaries by confining the Russian ambassador Bulgakoff in the Castle of the Seven Towers. On October 12th, Suvarov (or Suwarrow) began the second war. Austria had never led so powerful an army against the Turks. Her force included 245,000 infantry, 37,000 cavalry, and 900 guns, but no plan of co-operation with the Russians had been evolved.

Prince Josias of Saxe-Coburg captured Chotin, the famous Laudon Novi and Dubicza in Bosnia in 1788; Potemkin conquered Oczakoff on September 17th, 1788, and in the Crimea the city of Hajibei, the later Odessa, in the autumn of 1789.

On April 1st, 1789, Abdul Hamid I. died, and was succeeded by Selim III. (1789-1807), an energetic character, and the only son of Mustafa III., who had hitherto pursued his studies in the Seraglio; he was the bitter enemy of Austria. The first important events during the continuation of the war were the victories of Coburg and Suvarov at Focsani on August 1st, and of Clerfaut at Mehadia on the Cerna at Orsova; on September 22nd followed the victory of Suvarov and Coburg at Martinestie on the Rimnek. On

October 8th Belgrade was surrendered, and the imperial banner again floated on the battlements of the fortress.

Joseph's system of government, however, excited the strongest opposition, both in the Netherlands and in Hungary. Austria was obliged to agree to negotiations at Sistova. The Russians gave a decided refusal to send delegates to the congress, and declined to admit any intervention whatever on the part of foreign powers. On December 22nd, 1790, Suvarov had stormed Ismail, the strongest of all the for-

tresses on the Danube. The French Revolution forced Austria and Prussia to compose their difference; the result of their deliberations was the convention of Sistova on the Danube, August 4th, 1791. The allied imperial courts had failed to obtain their object—the partition of European Turkey. Leopold II., emperor since February 20th, 1790, was forced to surrender the fertile district of Wallachia, and even his acquisitions of Laudon and Belgrade; it was settled that the stream of Cerna should henceforward form the frontier.

After the death of Potemkin, on October 16th, 1791, the peace of Jassy was finally concluded on January 9th, 1792, by Count Besborodko. The northern shore of the Black Sea had become Russian.

HEINRICH ZIMMERER



AN ENERGETIC SULTAN
Selim III., the bitter enemy of Austria, and only son of Mustafa III., reigned from 1789 till 1807.

The Sultan's
Tottering
Throne



ARMENIA AND THE ARMENIANS

ARMENIA, situated in Asia, has an Asiatic history down to the period of the Roman world-empire, into which it was absorbed. But from the disruption of that empire it becomes in religion and politics so bound up with the West, and especially with the Ottoman Empire, that it is best treated in connection with Eastern Europe. After

Armenian Religion Tolerated by the Mohammedans the downfall of the Sassanid kingdom (651) the Armenians came under the dominion of

the Arabs, and since that time have been subject, with short interruptions, to the Mohammedan Arabs, Seljuks, Mongols, Tartars, Persians and Ottomans, without, however, accepting Mohammedanism. The Mohammedans tolerated their religion, and set them free from East Roman supremacy, which the Armenians hated, until the late Middle Ages, with a hatred which runs like a blood-stained thread through the whole of their theological literature, notwithstanding all the attempts at reunion which were occasionally made on either side.

How far the Armenians were successful during the Parthian and Sassanid period in assimilating the people of Greater Armenia is a question which has never yet been thoroughly investigated. In the valley of the Upper Tigris and Euphrates, during the first thousand years of the Christian era, the express testimony of Armenian and Syrian authors and the place names of the district show the predominance of Aramaic, Syrian, and (in the eastern mountains) of Kurdish populations, and in the northern district as far as Basean (Phasiane) the dominant Armenian population is decidedly in the minority compared with the foreign populations, which belong chiefly to Iberian and Georgian stocks; this, indeed, is the state of affairs at the present day.

It is probable that only in Upper Armenia was there anything like a dense Armenian population, which had settled in the district of Ararat, Turuberan, and Vaspurakan. Upon the restoration of the

old limits of the Byzantine Empire in Thrace after the downfall of the East Bulgarian Empire (970 A.D.), it was not so much the Greek nationality that brought about the revival, but, on the contrary, the Armenian population, which gave the Byzantine Empire its best rulers and generals between 867 (Basil I.) and 1025 (Basil II.). The Armenian John I. Tsimiskis followed the example of Constantine V. in settling numbers of his compatriots about the newly-conquered town Philippopolis to secure its safety.

The kingdom, however, reached its highest pitch of prosperity under the Jewish race of the Bagratids, nine kings of which between 859 and 1045 ruled almost independently the great buffer state between the empires of the Arab caliphs and the East Roman emperors. At that time the fortified capital of Ani on the Arpatshai and Alajajai was decorated with castles, palaces, and churches, the ruins of which astonish, even at the present day, the wanderer in the west of Alagoez. Tshoruk in the Caucasus was the cradle of the race of the Bagratids; after their conversion they secured the royal power in Grusia as well as in Armenia, and, like their great ancestor Tigranes, showed themselves invariably friendly to the Jews. In consequence, numerous colonies of the Israelites settled in Erevantashad, Van, Nachitshewan, and Artaxata. However, in terror before the invading Seljuks, Senekherim, the last of the Artsrunians, ceded his kingdom, in 1021, to the East Romans—an

Armenians Refuse Union With Rome example followed by Gagik the Bagratid in 1045; but submission naturally failed to prevent the utter devastation of these districts by the Seljuk and Mongol invaders.

After the destruction of Ani numbers of fugitives fled into the Caucasus and the mountains of Pontus, to Trebizond, to the Byzantine Empire, to Russia, to the Crimea, to Poland, and Galicia. A large number settled on the far side of the


ARMENIA AND THE ARMENIANS

Taurus in the kingdom of Cilicia. At this point in Tarsus and Sis the Armenians once founded a native kingdom ("Armenia Minor"), which from 1080, under the Bagratid Reuben and his successors, repeatedly joined in battle with Byzantium and in friendship with the crusading states, and even attempted a union with Rome, which was often concluded and as often broken, for the reason that the Armenians clung tenaciously to their national liturgy.

When, however, in the year 1375, the last king, Leon VI. of the house of Lusignan, was obliged to surrender his last castle to the Egyptian Mamelukes, the nation preserved a merely ecclesiastical existence in the patriarchate seats of Sis and Etchmiadsin. However, like fire in the ashes, their own poetry and literature remained alive, cherished in the numerous

of their patron the Surb Karapet (St. John), and instituted annual poetical contests in his sanctuary at Mush.

In the fourteenth century, when the Armenians both in the south and in the north succumbed to the Turks, the Turkish yoke was not oppressive; and, shortly after the conquest of Constantinople, in 1463, they received permission to retain their own patriarch, while they secured the confidence of the Sublime Porte itself and grew rich in its service. In Persia, however, they had to undergo a period of deep tribulation when Shah Abbas I. transported the best portion of the Armenian nation, under circumstances of great cruelty, to Ispahan (the suburb of Julfa), and in 1614 went so far as to transfer the national sanctuary to



THE GREAT ARMENIAN FORTRESS OF VAN AS IT WAS IN MEDIÆVAL TIMES

monasteries of Asia Minor and Southern Europe; while the industrial population gained a living as shepherds and farmers in the gorges of the Taurus and in the mountains of Upper Armenia, and the capable townspeople laid the foundation of their wealth in Byzantium, Smyrna, Damascus, and Alexandria. The most brilliant representative of the abundant Armenian literature of that period was

Annual Poetical Contests Among the Armenians Nerses Klajetsi, otherwise Snorhali (the Graceful) Catholicus from 1066 to 1073. Many hymns and songs were collected in the "Sharakan," the Armenian liturgical book, while the ballad singers, "Ashuges and Sasandares," whose names have disappeared, guarded the perennial fountain of popular poetry, and formed a society under the protection

Persia; it was not restored to Etchmiadsin, with the relics of St. Gregory, until 1683.

During the Persian persecutions the Armenians had been dispersed far westward, even to Italy and France. In particular, a considerable colony was received in the Polish town of Lemberg, which, with its bishop, was induced by Jesuit influence in 1625 to accept union with Rome. This was the beginning of the great intellectual movement which was soon to embrace the whole of Armenia. Clergy were sent out from Etchmiadsin to found Armenian printing-presses. These were erected, in 1616, at Lemberg, in 1640 at Julfa and Livorno, in 1660 at Amsterdam—transferred to Marseilles in 1672—in Constantinople in 1677, and elsewhere. "But the imperishable service of winning back the Armenians to European culture,"

says the historian Gelzer, "is the glorious work of Mechitar and of his order the Mechitarists, who settled at Venice in 1717 on the island of San Lazzaro, together with the mission to the Catholic Armenians; but apart from this, their labours as authors and their splendid printing exercised a highly important influence upon the development of modern Armenian literature and upon scientific knowledge among their nation." Mechitar (the Consoler) da Pietro was born in Sebaste on February 7th, 1676, and after long persecution on the part of his compatriots founded a congregation of Armenian Christians in Constantinople in 1701, a community which soon fell under the suspicion of the patriarch on account of its leanings to the Latin Church. In consequence Mechitar removed, in 1703, to Modon in the Morea, where he received permission from the Venetian republic to build a monastery and church. After their secession to the communion of the Armenian Uniates, the congregation was confirmed by Pope Clement XI. in 1712, and received a rule similar to the Benedictine. The war which broke out in 1714 between Turkey and the Venetians necessitated a migration to Venice, where the Senate granted them the island of San Lazzaro (1717), upon which their magnificent monastery was erected. Mechitar died there on April 27th, 1749.

Turkey at War with the Venetians

The Mechitarists had a ritual of their own for purpose of worship, and devoted themselves after 1708, when the first printing-press was set up, more particularly to the publication of the classics in Armenian. Their most famous productions are their Bibles; the text was improved by Mechitar in 1733, and appeared in 1805, based on the collation of nine manuscripts. The press catalogue of 1716 to 1898 includes 1,000 entries of books, chiefly in the Armenian language, which provided numbers of the nation with first-hand information upon Western science, and upon the history of the Armenian East as derived from manuscripts.

After the death of Mechitar twenty-one priests migrated from San Lazzaro to Trieste, where the support of the bishop and the authorities of the town enabled them to found the Mechitar congregation of Trieste on May 19th, 1773. The Empress

Maria Theresa conferred important privileges upon the congregation, and on March 20th, 1775, secured their recognition by the State as an ecclesiastical order, and gave them a piece of ground. Shortly afterwards the Mechitarist printing-press was opened in Trieste in 1776. The French administration, however, of 1810 brought about the suppression of the monastery and the press, which had produced many books in Armenian, German, Latin, ancient and modern Greek, Italian and French.

The Armenian Uniates maintained their position since the period of the Crusades and the Unitores, and had gradually increased, though to no great extent. Almost contemporaneously with the rise of the Mechitarist movement a Catholicate was created in actual communion with Rome. Abraham, the Catholic Armenian Bishop of Aleppo (1710), founded the monastery of Kerem in Lebanon, to which he gave the rule of St. Antonius. In 1740 his adherents made him patriarch of Sis, and in 1742 he received the pallium from Pope Benedict XIV. He was, however, unable to maintain his position in Cilicia against the persecutions of the Gregorians, and the Catholicus transferred his residence to Lebanon, where he died in 1749.

Russia's Bid For Armenian Friendship

The efforts of the Russians to secure the favour of the Armenians, who had obeyed the Ottomans and the Persians since 1555, were highly encouraging. In the year 1768 the Empress Catherine II. reminded the Catholicus Simon that her predecessors upon the throne, Peter the Great and Catherine I., had assured the Catholicus of their particular respect for the Armenian nation by autograph letters in 1724 and 1726. Further communications from the Tsar Paul I. in 1798 and 1800 opened to the Armenian leaders and clergy the prospect of placing their countrymen under the protection of Russia. The Persian rulers had made similar promises to the patriarchs; hence in 1768 Catherine II., resolved not to let slip the opportunity of "protecting" Armenia, concluded a formal convention with the Archbishop Arguthianz, promising nothing less than the restoration of the old Armenian independent Christian kingdom. Thenceforth Armenia occupies a prominent position in the Eastern Question of the nineteenth century and of the present day.

HEINRICH ZIMMERER



THE HUNS ON THE WARPATH AND THE BARBARIC TRIUMPHS OF ATILA

ABOUT the year 50 B.C. the Mongolian kingdom of the Hiung nu in the north of China had been divided into an eastern and northern portion. The eastern state came to an end in 142 A.D., and its people were for the most part absorbed by degrees into the Chinese Empire; the northern kingdom of the Huns, however, succumbed as early as 84 A.D. to the repeated attacks of their more powerful foes the Sien pe and of other Siberian Tungusian tribes. Part of the Hun population then fled westward to the steppes of Lake Aral, where a separate kingdom had been founded under Tshi tshi immediately after the disruption of the empire.

Considerably reinforced by the arrival of these fugitives, about 90 A.D., this nomad power extended so rapidly in the course of the following century that it reached the Caspian Sea and came under the notice of European geographers such as Dionysios Priegetes about 130 and Ptolemy about 150. About the year 300 the state was involved in war with Tiri-dates the Great of Armenia, became a disturbing force among the peoples of Eastern Europe, and was able to make a considerable step westward about the middle of the fourth century, after attaining more or less success in a series of petty struggles.

At this point we should emphasise the fact that the ethnological character of these composite Hun people must have been considerably changed during these years by the reception and incorporation of related and foreign elements; the truth of the matter probably is that only the leaders and the nobles of the hordes were of pure Mongolian blood, while the majority were a very mixed race, containing infusions of other branches of the Ural-Altaic-speaking peoples, of the Turkoman Tartars, of Finns and Ugrians, and also of the Sarmatians and others. All that we know of the customs and manners of the Huns is in correspondence

with the peculiar characteristics of Mongolian races. This remark is also true of their physical characteristics, as described by contemporary writers—their large round heads, small deep-set eyes, prominent cheek-bones, flat noses, dirty complexion, low stature, broad chests, and heavy build above the waist. In certain races this original type had so far disappeared under the influence of infusions from elsewhere that we may doubt whether the result was rather Turkish or Finnish. These tribes were accustomed to slit the cheeks of their children in order to prevent the growth of hair; their noses were tied down with broad bands, and the skull compressed at the sides.

The Huns were true nomads, possessing neither houses nor huts. Their women—they were polygamists—and their children they led about from place to place in covered waggon, pasturing their herds in summer on the wide steppes, and retiring to the river-beds in winter. They were hardy riders, accustomed to remain day and night in the saddle, where they ate and drank. The horse, the sword, and the favourite tools of a dead man were buried with his body, which was placed in a grave with the head towards the west and the face turned to the rising sun. Over the grave a mound was erected on which the meal of the dead was placed. Singers then extolled the deeds of the departed in their songs, while the relatives cropped their hair and slit their cheeks in token of their grief. About the year 372 the Huns left their new habitation and advanced into the district on this side of the Volga, subjugating in 375 the Alans, who were living on the Don and the Sea of Azov; part of the Alans were speedily incorporated with the conquerors. Under the leadership of Balamber, or Balamir, they attacked the

Curious Habits and Customs of the Huns

Fugitive Huns Disturb Eastern Europe

Suicide of Centenarian King

Eastern Goths, whose king Hermanarich, who was more than one hundred years old, committed suicide upon losing a decisive battle. His successor, Vithimir, or Vinitharius, fell in a battle; his two sons and some adherents fled to the Western Goths, while a larger portion of the Eastern Goths, who were led by Gesimund, submitted

Asiatic Nomads Pour Into Europe to the supremacy of the Huns. The Western Goths afterwards retired behind the Pruth, and when the

Huns also passed the Dniester they escaped after a short time, some behind the Sereth to Kaukaland, the modern Transylvania, under the leadership of Athanarich, while another portion, the Tervings, who had accepted Christianity, entered the Roman Empire at the advice of their Bishop Ulfilas, under the leadership of Fritigern, whither Athanarich followed in 380, notwithstanding his hatred of Rome, as he had been expelled from Transylvania.

The Hunnish hordes of Balamber now overran the whole country of the Danube; only the lower portion of this river and the territory about its mouth divided them from the Roman Empire. Both for the civilised and for the barbarian nations this mighty invasion of Europe by Asiatic nomads had grievous consequences. All traces disappeared of the rising German civilisation, which had been begun by the Goths; rich colonies and flourishing settlements fell into ruins. The wooden palaces of the chieftains of the Huns advanced nearer year by year to the borders of civilisation, and Hunnish mercenaries soon became one of the main supports of the Roman domination, which was then entering on its decline.

During the years 400 to 408 the government was in the hands of Uldin, and in the first half of the fifth century three brothers reigned over the Huns—Mundzuk—known as Bendeguz in the Hungarian traditions—Oktar, and Rua—also known as Rof,

Hun Ruler Dies from Gluttony Rugha, and Rugilas. Oktar, who was in the pay of the Romans, appeared several times on the Rhine and disturbed the Burgundians; he died in that district, as a result of excessive gluttony, on the eve of a battle. His inheritance was divided between his brothers Mundzuk, who died early, and Rua; the latter was in friendly relations with Byzantium, and was granted the title of general by Theodosius II., together with a yearly

subsidy of 350 pounds of gold (about £22,000). Upon his death, in 434 A.D., the supremacy was taken over by his nephews Bleda (or Buda, by Hungarian tradition) and Attila, the sons of Mundzuk.

Many different attempts have been made to explain the meaning of the name of Attila, the greatest of the Hun Kings. Some derive it from the Gothic "Atta," or father, and consider it as meaning "little father;" probably, however, it is connected with the name by which the Byzantines denoted the Volga in the sixth century. Magyar myths call him Etele, and in the German heroic legends he is known as Etzel. The year and the place of his birth are equally unknown. Upon his father's death Attila was sent by his uncle, Rua, as a hostage to Novæ, where he made the acquaintance of his later opponent, Aëtius, who was there living in similar circumstances. Here he acquired some tincture of Byzantine culture. Immediately after his accession the two Hunnish princes renewed their peace with the emperor Theodosius under conditions of great severity: the Byzantines

Attila's Way of Enriching Friends were forced to dissolve all their alliances with the peoples in the Danube district, to surrender all

Hunnish subjects who had taken refuge with them, and also to pay a yearly tribute of five hundred pounds of gold. Attila discovered an easy mode of enriching his favourites by suddenly sending one or another of them with some despatch or proposal to the court of Constantinople, which was then forced to expend rich presents in return for the supposed communication.

The Hunnish hordes subjugated the German and Slav peoples on the Danube; Attila's eldest son, Ellak, ruled over the Ugrian hunting people of the Akatzires on the Don from 488. At an early date Attila turned westward, and between 435 and 437 destroyed the flourishing Burgundian kingdom on the Central Rhine and on the east of Gaul; the king, Gundihar, or Gundicharius, was killed. In the year 441 the town of Margum, at the confluence of the Margus (Moravia) and the Lower Danube, fell into the hands of the Huns, who from that date remained the perpetual guests of the East Roman Empire.

Under excuses of a very varied nature Attila now sent out his bands to invade Moesia, Thracia, and Illyria; a delay in payment of the yearly tribute or the flight

THE HUNS ON THE WARPATH

of some Hunnish grandee whom he was pursuing provided sufficient excuse for such aggression.

In 445 he removed his brother Bleda by a treacherous murder. Shortly afterwards a Hun shepherd brought in a sword which was said to have fallen from heaven; to this object the superstitious people attached the significance of future imperial power, and Attila encouraged his people in this belief. He himself was convinced of the possibility of his future empire, in view of the weakness which then prevailed in the East Roman Empire. In the year 447 he advanced with his bands as far as Thermopylæ; the Emperor Theodosius then begged for peace, which was granted him, at the beginning of 448, at the price of a war indemnity of six thousand pounds of gold (English money, £275,000) and a yearly tribute of two thousand one hundred pounds of gold (£95,000). Shortly afterwards (448) he sent Ediko, one of his nobles, to Constantinople to receive the yearly tribute, which the Byzantine court could collect only by means of extortion from the im-

Plot Against Attila Discovered and Defeated impoverished people; he further demanded from Theodosius II. the cession of the whole of the right bank of the Danube. Thereupon Chrysaphius "Tzuma," the all-powerful eunuch of the empire, induced the Hunnish ambassador to join a conspiracy for the murder of Attila.

In the year 449 the Byzantine embassy approached Attila to treat with him concerning his new demands. The leader of the embassy, the senator Maximin, and his secretary Priscus, a rhetorician and sophist from Pannonia, fortunately for themselves, knew nothing of the conspiracy, though the interpreter Vigilas was a party to it. However, Ediko himself betrayed the proposal to his master, who joyfully seized this favourable opportunity to demand from the Emperor Theodosius the head of the hated Chrysaphius, together with an increase in the amount of the yearly tribute; it was with great difficulty that he was persuaded to give up this demand.

To the rhetorician Priscus we owe an important description of his travels, which gives us a glimpse of life at the Hunnish court. He describes the capital and the simple palace of Attila, which was situated somewhere between the Theiss

and the Danube, in the modern lowlands of Hungary, possibly near Tokai. He also gives us a description of the dwellings of the Hunnish grandees, including that of the minister Onegesius (Hunigis, a Goth by descent). He informs us that upon the entry of Attila the monarch was preceded by a band of girls in white garments. Priscus made the acquaintance of Queen Kreka, to whom he handed the presents of the emperor. He was present at a banquet given in honour of the embassy, at which singers and jesters attempted to entertain the courtiers, while the Hunnish monarch sat buried in gloomy silence, with a whole band of Greek interpreters and Roman scribes awaiting his commands. It appears from this narrative that the Hunnish king found Roman culture indispensable. By his diplomatic insight, his great generalship, his personal bravery and daring, he so entirely surpassed contemporary princes that from the Rhine to the Volga, from the Baltic to the shores of the Black Sea, nations anxiously awaited their fates at the hands of this powerful and gloomy conqueror.

In the summer of 450 disturbance broke out in Constantinople; Theodosius died in the course of a revolt, Chrysaphius was executed, and Marcianus ascended the tottering throne. When the ambassadors of the Hunnish kingdom came to Constantinople shortly after his accession to demand the yearly tribute he gave them a short answer—"Gold for my friends and steel for my enemies." Attila was apparently satisfied with this answer. Geiserich, the king of the Vandals, had, about 446, mutilated the first wife of his eldest son, Hunerich, in consequence of some suspicion; she was a daughter of the West Goth Theoderic I., and dreading the revenge of the Goths, he concluded an alliance with Attila, who now turned his attention to the West Roman empire.

Roman Princess Desires to Marry Attila The reigning emperor, Valentinian III., had designed that his sister Grata Justa Honoria should take the veil; she, however, had begun a love affair with her procurator Eugenius, had been banished for some time to Byzantium in consequence, and on her return home had secretly sent Attila a ring, thus offering herself to him as his wife. For the moment Attila vouchsafed no answer to the proposal, but at a later date he sent

repeated demands to Valentinian, requesting the bride for his harem and half of the western empire as her dowry, basing these demands on the gift of the ring. The refusal to these requests was transmitted to the Hunnish ambassador in the name of the emperor by Aëtius, "the last of the Romans," the companion of

Eastern Europe Converted into an Armed Camp

Attila's youth. In fierce anger Attila now turned the whole of Eastern Europe into an armed camp. In the spring of 451 he advanced with a gigantic army, composed of the most different nationalities—said to amount to 500,000 men—along the Danube towards Gaul. The attention of the Hun prince had been drawn to this country in 448 by a rebel named Eudoxius, and afterwards by the Vandal Geiserich and by an ambitious Frank; a long series of ruined towns marked his progress. At Strasburg, Attila crossed the Rhine with his army, burned Metz, and attempted to capture Orleans. However, the inhabitants of the town held out, under the leadership of their bishop, until the vanguard of the army of Aëtius appeared; he had been joined, after long negotiations, by Theoderic, the king of the West Goths.

Attila raised the siege and led his columns back to the wide plain extending towards Troyes and Mery, between the Seine and the Marne.

On the field of Mauriazen, or Katalaun, in the beginning of July, the great battle of peoples took place in which Roman Christianity was opposed to the Huns and heathendom. After fearful slaughter—reports vary between 160,000 and 300,000 men, while later legends asserted that even the fallen continued to struggle in the air—Attila retired to his bivouac at nightfall, and the death-songs of the Huns were heard even in the camp of the conquerors. The Hunnish king hastily erected a funeral pile of saddles, on which he proposed to undergo a voluntary death by fire in case of a renewed attack by the victorious enemy. Aëtius, however, did not wish to destroy so valuable a counterpoise to the Gothic power, and had, moreover, himself gained the victory at the price of heavy sacrifices; further-

more, the West Goths had immediately marched home on the death of their king. Attila was thus able to retire to Pannonia without opposition.

In the following year, 452, Attila marched upon Italy with a strong army. After a siege of several months he captured the town of Aquileia, the gate of Italy, and levelled it to the ground. The smoking ruins of Padua, Verona, Milan, and many other towns marked the path of the Hunnish bands as they marched upon Rome. The whole civilised world was awaiting with horror the fall of the "eternal city," when Attila suddenly began to retreat. To this step he was probably induced, not so much by the magnificent present sent him by Pope Leo I. at Mincio, as by the news that the East Roman Emperor Marcian had invaded Pannonia, and that an even more

dangerous adversary, Aëtius, was collecting an army for the relief of Rome. To these motives must be added the intolerable heat, the unaccustomed climate, plague, the lack of provisions, and last, but certainly not least, superstition.

It was thought that the conqueror of Rome would die shortly after the capture of the city, as Alaric had died before. The fact remains that Attila retreated homeward to the banks of the Theiss. After threatening the Byzantines with punishment in the following year, he

died in the winter of the year 453 of hæmorrhage on the night of his marriage with Idlika, known to German legend as Kriemhild. The body was buried in an unknown spot, and the workmen employed upon the grave were killed, that no one might be able to betray the last resting-place of the Hunnish monarch. Rome and

Byzantium had lost a dangerous foe. After Attila's death both his empire and his people declined with rapid strides. Ellak, his destined successor, had acquired Roman culture and Roman military tactics in his early youth, but was not a suitable ruler for a barbaric people of nomads. The new ruler was attacked by Attila's other sons, especially Dengizich and Irnach. This fratricidal effort led to no result, while the



"THE SCOURGE OF GOD"

The claim to this title was made by Attila, the Hunnish leader, whose hordes overran all Eastern Europe.

Attila Dies, and His Empire Rapidly Declines



THE CHURCH FACES THE BARBARIAN: THE POPE AND ATTILA, THE HUN

Attila's course of devastation was a track of utter ruin, the avowed purpose of "the Scourge of God," as he claimed to be. But it is said that Pope Leo I. met him with all the majesty of the Church Established, and succeeded for a time in staying the hand of the destroying Hun. After Attila's death the Huns declined and finally disappeared from history.

From the painting by Chenavard, by permission of Messrs. Braun, Clement et Cie.

Goths and the Gepids seized this opportunity to revolt. Ellak marched against the rebels, but his army was defeated by the mighty force of the Gepids (under Ardarich), Goths, Rugians, and Herulians at the river Netad in Pannonia, where Ellak lost his life. Dengizich now undertook the leadership of the Huns, who had

**Defeated Huns
Make Alliance
With the Goths**

been driven back to the plains between the Lower Danube and the Don. In 456 and 462 he attacked the Pannonian Goths on the Save, but was twice defeated by King Valemir. He then made an alliance with the Goths, and advanced to Dacia and Moesia. Three armies sent against him by the East Roman Empire were enticed by the allies into a narrow valley, where they were surrounded and almost exterminated. Nevertheless, in the year 469 Dengizich again invaded Thrace, but on this occasion he was captured by the Roman Anagastus, was executed, and his head was sent to Constantinople. With his death ends the unity of the East European nomad peoples under the name of Huns, which had formerly been created by Rua and Attila. Irnach, accompanied by his brothers Emnedsur and Ultzindur, withdrew with the remnants of the Huns far into the steppes of South Russia.

For more than fifty years we hear no more of the Huns. Shortly before 523, the Byzantines mention the Hunnish tribe of the Uturgurs, whose king, Gorda, accepted Christianity, and was killed in a revolt led by his brother Muager. As early as 507 and 508 the Albanian Bishop Qarduct of Arran had made a missionary journey into the lands of the Sabir. In the middle of the sixth century Procopius speaks of the Huns as a people divided into the two tribes of the Kuturgurs and Uturgurs. The Kuturgurs, who were also known as Black Bulgarians, joined for the most part with the Avars,

**Huns Fall
From Place
and Power**

who are henceforward often known as Huns, in an expedition to Pannonia in 568; about 630 they were forced to leave this country in consequence of the failure of a revolt. The Khagan of the Avars now proclaimed himself ruler of the two Hun tribes, and sent a demand to Justin II. in 568 for the yearly subsidy which Byzantium had formerly paid. In the year 576 we find the Uturgurs, with their neighbours the Alans, subject to the

Western Turks. Shortly after that time the name of the Uturgurs disappears from history; their place is taken by the Bulgarians in Old or Greater Bulgaria to the east of the Sea of Azov. On the other hand, in 598 we meet again with the Kuturgurs, or Kotzagirs, who took refuge, to the number of 10,000 men, with the Avar Khagan, while flying, with the Huns of Tarniach and Zaben, from the Turks. But the supremacy of the Avars lasted only until 626.

At the outset of the seventh century the Prince Organa ruled over the Kuturgurs, who had remained on the Sea of Azov. He was an ally of the Emperor Heraclius, and accepted Christianity in 619. After the death of Organa, his cousin Kuvrat united his nation with their kinsmen the Bulgarians on the Kuban, and shook off the yoke of the Avars. After the death of Kuvrat, in 668, this allied tribe divided into five different hordes under his sons.

One horde was united about 679 with the Khazars under Bäg-Bajan, the eldest son of Kuvrat; with these the Bulgarians had formerly been in alliance as a neighbouring people, and were now to be conquered by them. The danger threatened by their neighbours, the Turkish Pechenegs, induced the Magyars about 840 to form an alliance with the Khazars, under whose supremacy they retained possession for twenty years of their second European home, Lebedia, to the east of the Don. When the Hungarians abandoned these districts shortly after 862, they were joined by the Kabars, who now broke away from their mother tribe the Khazars.

The empire founded by the Khazars, augmented by the remnants of the Huns, became a formidable menace to the South Caucasian peoples in consequence of its great raids, ending in 799. About 969 the empire fell before the advance of the Russian Svjatoslav.

The second horde of the Hunnish Bulgarians found a temporary home to the west of the Don. The third horde, mingled with other tribes of the Huns, founded the modern Bulgaria under the leadership of Isperich, while the fourth, unless there is some confusion here with the above-mentioned settlements of 568, advanced to Pannonia.

Thus the nationality of the Huns was broken up, coalesced with other nations, and then disappeared.

HEINRICH VON WLISLOCKI



THE OLD BULGARIAN KINGDOM AND ITS LONG STRUGGLE WITH BYZANTIUM

THE desert between the Ural Mountains, the Caspian Sea, and Lake Aral was at one time the home of those Ugrian families of peoples to which the Bulgarians belonged. How long the Ugrians may have inhabited these districts is impossible to say. At some time or other Ugrian races were driven into that territory by the Sabires, who, on their side, had retreated from the Avars, who were driven out by the Huns; at that time it is probable that the Voguls and Ostiaks, perhaps also some Magyar tribes, had retired northwards to the Tobol, Irtysh, and Ob. On the other hand, the eastern branch for the most part extended at least to the Lower Volga and the Caucasus district, in the neighbourhood of which Bulgarian tribes, who had emigrated at an earlier period, must have been settled. These North Caucasian Bulgarians were strongly influenced by the overwhelming invasion of the Huns. The fact is undoubted that it was the Bulgarians who formed the main element of the Hunnish armies; hence we may explain the fact that we hear of Hunnish Bulgarians in the land of the Alans in the fourth century, and that we learn, shortly after 375, of the Langobards being overwhelmed by Bulgarians of this kind.

Mingling of the Huns and Bulgarians

Thus during those decades the Bulgarians must have partly exchanged their old name for that of Hun. This fact naturally does not facilitate the task of distinguishing the individual families of Mongolian race, of which we have in any case only scanty records, difficult to interpret. The Huns, as we have seen, had gradually received large reinforcements from other members of the Ural Altaic-speaking peoples; and their Turkish-Tartar nationality had been so entirely transformed thereby, that it is difficult to say whether the hordes who invaded Europe were primarily of Turkish or Finnish race.

After the disruption of the Hunnish unity in 469 A.D., this same phenomenon, which reduces every conscientious

historian to complete despair, is repeated with greater intensity. The tribes formerly subjected to the Huns had now indeed recovered their freedom; but they had been subject for so long a period to Hunnish supremacy, had so entirely assimilated their manners and customs, had felt themselves to be so entirely members of the great Hunnish

Predominance of the Bulgarians

nationality on their marauding expeditions, and had so often acted in accordance with this belief, that contemporary chroniclers are continually in a state of confusion as regards the identity of these separate elements; Avars, Bulgarians, Sabines, etc., are shortly and simply known as "Huns." A century later the opposite tendency is in force; the remnants of the Hun nationality are incorporated with the Bulgarian people, and the name of Hun disappears from history, although the representatives of this nationality were by no means extinct.

In that highly disturbed age of the great migrations we hear only occasionally, with the exception of the events above mentioned, of actions which can be ascribed with any certainty to the North Caucasian Bulgarians alone. In the year 482 the emperor Zeno invited their help against the Eastern Goths. This was the first occasion on which the Bulgarians came into practical contact with the East Roman Empire. In 505, Sabinianus, the Magister Militum of Illyricum, at the head of 10,000 Bulgarian auxiliary troops, was defeated on the Morava while operating against Mundo the Gepid and Pitzia the Goth. From the shattered remnants of the Western Bul-

In Contact with the Eastern Empire

garian outposts left in these districts, that branch may have been formed or have diverged, which was received about 670, under its leader Alzece, into the old land of the Samnites by the Langobard Duke Romuald of Beneventum. In any case, at that moment the main body of the North Caucasian Bulgarians were in enjoyment of complete independence from

the time that Kuvrat shook off the yoke of the Avars, about 635, and founded a formidable state in conjunction with the other branches of the Southern Ugrians who had been driven into that district.

However, in 679 the power of the Unugundur Bulgarians was so entirely shattered that for a time only fragmentary remnants of them existed; their destroyers were the West Turkish Khazars, among whose earliest conquests and settlements are included the East Caucasian plains on the Terek and Ssulak, together with the nomad settlements of Balangar and Samandar. Yet the broken power recovered itself with comparative rapidity, and soon became a force to be reckoned with. One portion was entirely absorbed by the Khazars; Isperich, the third son of Kuvrat, founded a new kingdom on the Lower Danube, the fate of which will be followed more in detail below; the fourth and fifth sons with their following migrated to the Avars.

The second son of Kuvrat, Kotrag, settled on the right bank of the Don, and from this point advanced along the valley of the central Volga to the country of the Kama (known at this point as the Isgil, the second of three or four tribes of these Volga Bulgarians), where he founded the state of "Great Bulgaria." This name also gives rise to difficulties. The shores of the Sea of Azov, which were occupied by those Hunnish Bulgarian Uturgurs who fell victims in 568 to the Avars and in 576, together with the Alans, to the Western Turks, are now called, as occasion rises, either "old" or "great" Bulgaria until the occupation by the Magyars in the first half of the ninth century.

Special care must be taken to avoid any confusion of the "Old Bulgaria" on the Kuban with the other "Old Bulgaria" in Europe. Now that all the remaining

The Two "Old Bulgarias" Bulgarian states have entirely disappeared from the map, the term "Old Bulgaria" is justifiably used to distinguish this country from the modern Bulgaria; it will occupy our attention later on. Of greater permanence than that Uturgur kingdom was Great Bulgaria, created by a remarkable retrograde movement of the bands of Kotrag on the Volga and Kama, which showed considerable powers of endurance, and flourished from the ninth

to the thirteenth century. We may connect this state with al-Balchi.

On the Volga and the Kama the Bulgarians certainly carried on cattle-breeding and agriculture to some extent. They were soon in constant communication with the Arabs; as early as the year 922 the Bulgarians are said to have accepted Mohammedanism, a statement which appears credible. In consequence of their intercourse with the Arabs, these Volga Bulgarians acquired considerable influence over the neighbouring Ugrian races, the Magyars and others. Among other proofs of the fact are a few surviving monuments, written in a language similar to that of the modern Chuvashes; instances are the inscriptions on the grave-stones found in the ruins of the town of Bulgar on the Kama, also the remnants of a list enumerating the heathen princes of the Danube Bulgarians before 765, wherein the ages are given in old Bulgarian numerals, which can be compared with the words in Chuvash.

The development of Great Bulgaria was hindered for a time by the invasions from the Baltic of the Norse Vikings, or Russians; in 969 they devastated Bulgaria, and a considerable proportion of the inhabitants removed to Hungary. Notwithstanding the repeated invasions of the Russians, Greater Bulgaria maintained its independence for a long period. We have specimens of Arab coins, dated 976 and 977, which were struck in Bulgar and in Suvar in the name of the Bulgarian prince Mumin ben Ahmad. Besides agriculture, the Volga Bulgarians learnt from Iranian immigrants manufacture and trade which rapidly developed in the towns of Suvar, Bulgar, and Bilar, and extended even as far as Persia. In the thirteenth century Greater Bulgaria lost its independence; the country was conquered by the Tartars, and afterwards fell into the hands of the Muscovite Tsars.

The Bulgarians who had migrated to the left bank of the Lower Danube under Isperich, the son of Kuvrat, had meanwhile extended their settlements in the district between the Dniester and the Danube, whence they made invasions into Moesia and into Thrace. The Byzantine emperor, Constantine IV. Pogonatus, sent a punitive expedition against

THE OLD BULGARIAN KINGDOM

them in 679, with a precisely opposite result to that intended; the victorious Bulgarians moved to the right bank of the Danube in the same year, and Isperich occupied the territory from the Moesian plain to the shores of the Black Sea. The Slavs settled in those districts resigned themselves more readily to their fate, as they were thereby freed from the hated Byzantine yoke. This European kingdom of Old Bulgaria extended so rapidly that, at the outset of the ninth century, it included all the numerous Slav races of the Balkan peninsula, who under this new and comparatively mild government soon united into one people, and adopted the name of their conquerors, the Bulgarians. The ruling class was weak in numbers, was soon subdued by the higher civilisation of their Slav subjects, and adopted their language after two or three centuries, certainly after their prosperous period.

This Old Bulgarian state, the centre of gravity of which lay in the plains of the modern Dobrudza, was ruled under an aristocratic constitution. The supreme power was in the hands of a prince,

Barbaric Customs of the Bulgarians known by the native name of Khan; he was supported by a council of six nobles, or *boyars*. Serfdom was an

ancient institution, and hence the administration of justice was barbaric and arbitrary. Rebel nobles not only lost their property and wealth, but their entire families were also exterminated. Polygamy was usual; when the husband died, his wives were burned with his corpse or buried in the same grave. Human sacrifices, a practice indulged only at the expense of Latin and Greek enemies, are reported from the outset of the thirteenth century under the "Pious" Johannisza; an instance among the savage Cumanians belongs even to the year 1241.

Hardly had Isperich settled with his nation in the Lower Danube districts when the Byzantines, in order to save Thrace, were forced to agree to pay tribute under a convention of 679. When the Emperor Justinian II. Rhinotmetos, the last descendant of the house of Heraclius, refused the demand, Isperich defeated the Greeks and imposed a heavier tribute on them. Under his successor Tervel (about 700 to 720), the Byzantine emperor, who was exiled in 695, found his chief support in

the Bulgarians of Great Preslav. With the help of Tervel, Justinian, who had meanwhile married the Khazar princess Theodora, re-established himself in Constantinople in 705, heaped honours of every kind upon his ally, and conferred upon him the title of Cæsar, though shortly after he was ungrateful enough to dissolve

In Alliance with Byzantium the alliance and attempt to surprise the Bulgarian Khan. At Anchialos he was, however, himself defeated by the Bul-

garian ruler in 705, and was forced to pay a yearly tribute and to cede the Thracian district of Zagora, situated to the south of the Balkans, which afterwards gave its name to the Bulgarian kingdom of Tirnovo—a name in use for centuries among the Serbs, Byzantines, and Italians, though denoting different localities according to the changing situation of the race. When the Arabs besieged Constantinople in 717 the Bulgarians hastened to the help of the hard-pressed defenders and relieved the town in 718.

Under the two succeeding princes the Bulgarians lived in an alternate state of peace and war with the Byzantine Empire. When the iconoclast Constantine V. (741–775) ascended the East Roman throne, he made preparations in 758 for a campaign against the encroaching Bulgarians, but was defeated in 759 in the passes of Beregava, between Anchialos and Varna. Fortunately for Byzantium internal disturbances broke out among the Bulgarians, whose vigour had moreover been diminished by the transportation of more than 200,000 Slovenians to Bithynia in 762, immediately after the death of their prince Kormisos, of the house of Ukil, who on his side had overthrown the ruling dynasty of the Dulo in 753. Telec, or Teletsh (760–763), of the family of Ugain, was summoned to the throne; he, however, was defeated by the Greeks

At War with Byzantium at Anchialos, and died under the weapons of his own exasperated subjects. His successor Sabir—a Romanised Wallachian,

as the name implies—was soon deposed, and forced to flee to Constantinople. Under the princes Bajan, Umar, and Toktu confusion within and pressure from without reached their highest point. Part of Bulgaria was occupied by Byzantine troops, and the rest was devastated by the neighbouring Slav races. A change

of fortune took place upon the accession of Cerig shortly after 763. He succeeded by treachery, rather than by force of arms, in freeing his country from the East Romans; later he was expelled by his revolted nobles, and forced to flee to Constantinople, where he was baptised, and married one of the imperial princesses.

The Khan Annihilates a Greek Army

His successor, Kardam, defeated the Greeks on four occasions and forced them to pay a yearly tribute. Under the government of the Khan Krum (802 until April 13th, 814 or 815), who had conquered Serdika, or Sofia, in 809, the Emperor Nicephorus appeared with the object of definitely incorporating Bulgaria with his empire. The capital of Krum was levelled to the ground and all proposals for peace were rejected. The Khan closed the mountain passes with barricades and annihilated the whole Greek army, together with their emperor, on their retreat on the night of July 25-26, 811. In July, 813, Krum advanced against Michael I. Rhangabé as far as Adrianople; he captured the town, and transported 10,000 men with their wives and children to the left bank of the Danube.

His successors, Cok, or Dukum, and Diceng, remained within the frontiers of their own kingdom until the Bulgarian prince Omortag concluded an armistice in 817 for thirty years with the Emperor Leo V., desiring to turn his attention to the Franks, who were endangering the Bulgarian kingdom after the expulsion of the Avars from Pannonia. In 818, 822, and 824, requests were made to Lewis the Pious for admission to the Frankish imperial federation by the Eastern Abodrites from the old Servian town of Branicevo, which had for the moment shaken off the Bulgarian yoke, as a result of the revolt of the Pannonian Slovenian Ljudevit (819-828); a similar request was made by the Timoans on the Timok.

Bulgars at Belgrade 1,000 Years Ago

Omortag raised fruitless objections to these proposals in 824, conducted a successful war against Lewis the Pious between 827 and 828, and secured his supremacy over the Pannonian Slavs. However, the Bulgarian rule was of no long duration in this quarter; only the district at the mouths of the Save and Drave remained subject to them until the arrival of the Magyars. A Bulgarian official was resident in Belgrade as late

as 885. About 835 the "Macedonians," who had been forcibly removed in 813 to the far side of the Danube from Adrianople and its surroundings, attempted to avail themselves of the absence of some part of the Bulgarians, who had marched against Thessalonica under their leader Khan Boris-Michael, to flee to the Roman districts. They actually succeeded in their attempt, for when the Khan Vladimir, a grandson of Krum, crossed the Danube on this news, they inflicted such a blow upon him that he was forced to turn for help to the Magyars, who then dwelt not far from the Danube mouth; in the meantime the fugitives found their way safely on board the ships which the Emperor Theophilus had sent to meet them.

Under the Khan Presjam, Christianity had already begun to take root in the Bulgarian Empire. His successor, Boris, who reigned from 852, was largely occupied during the first half of his reign with wars against the Greeks, the Serbs, the Croats, and the Franks. For the most part his conflicts ended unfavourably. Against the Franks he fought in 853, as an ally of the

Spiritual Transformation of the Slavs

Moravian prince Rastislav; he also fought against the Pannonian Slavs at the instigation of Charles the Bald, who had suffered a severe defeat at the hands of Lewis the German. Boris now joined the East Frankish king, whose son, Karloman, had revolted with the help of Rastislav in 862. Karloman was beaten; Lewis and Boris concluded a treaty of alliance in 864 at Tulln on the Danube, which was renewed in 892 by the Emperor Arnulf, and remained in force for centuries. In the same, or in the following, year (865) the Byzantines ceded to the Bulgarians Zagoria, between the important frontier fortress Develtos, or Valandar, and the Iron Gate. There may be a connection between these and the following events.

A great transformation had been brought to pass in the spiritual life of the whole of the Slav people by the brothers Constantine and Methodius. By their efforts Christianity spread so rapidly in Lower Pannonia and Moravia, that the Bulgarian prince Boris found himself in the midst of powerful Christian nobles, whose doctrine he was forced to consider indispensable to the maintenance and security of his kingdom. Boris also became a Christian for political reasons. At first, in 864, he

THE OLD BULGARIAN KINGDOM

began to negotiate with Pope Nicholas I., through the medium of King Lewis, but afterwards preferred to turn to Byzantium; when he was there baptised, he took the name of Michael, in honour of his godfather the Emperor Michael III. He showed indefatigable energy in preaching the new faith to his subjects and also to the Slavs in the south-west, by the founding of seven churches, and by continual threats and exhortations, between 864 and 867, while he cruelly crushed the revolt of the nobles who remained faithful to heathendom; he even executed their women and children in a most cruel manner and exterminated whole families.

After a reign of thirty-six years, Boris abdicated, in 888, in favour of his eldest son Vladimir and retreated to a monastery. While Symeon, the youngest son of Boris, devoted himself to science in Constantinople with a zeal which afterwards procured him the nickname of the "Half Greek," Khan Vladimir led a dissipated life, and thereby seriously endangered the work his father had begun. After four years Boris found himself obliged to leave his monastery for a short time for the purpose of deposing Vladimir

**First of the
Bulgarian
National Saints**

and raising Symeon to the throne. Michael Boris died on May 2nd, 907. He is

the first of the series of Bulgarian national saints, and is revered as the converter of his nation to Christianity.

Under the government of Symeon (893-927) the Bulgarian state attained its greatest expansion. It extended from the banks of the Danube to the mountains of Rhodope and Pindus, and southward from Mesembria to Adrianople. Besides the Danube Bulgarians, he ruled over Macedonia, Thessaly, and Epirus, while Servia paid him tribute. By means of a series of fortunate campaigns, Symeon brought the East Roman Empire to the verge of destruction. The first inducement to a breach of the peace was given by the Byzantines themselves, who imposed heavy customs duties upon goods imported from Bulgaria. When Symeon was unable to remove this embargo upon Bulgarian trade by diplomatic means, he declared war; after he had beaten the guards of the capital in several battles, he sent home the Khazar mercenaries, whom he had captured, with their noses cut off.

The Emperor Leo VI. now called to his aid the heathen Magyars, who at this time,

in 894, occupied Moldavia and Wallachia. Symeon was forced to retire at the end of January, 895, before the general Nicephorus Phocas, who was quickly recalled from Asia Minor, while Bulgaria was devastated as far as the royal seat of Great Preslav by the Magyars and Khazar Kabars under Liuntis, the son of Arpad,

**More Wars
with
Byzantium**

who had been ferried across the Danube in the imperial ships. Symeon suffered two defeats, threw himself into the fortress of Drster, or Silistria, and begged for an armistice. The Emperor Leo agreed, and recalled his armies. Symeon forthwith, in May, 895, annihilated the Magyars whom the Byzantines had left on his side of the Danube, and those that were left on the further bank were driven away by the Pechenegs, who were in alliance with Symeon.

He then secured an advantageous peace from Byzantium by promising the unconditional return of the prisoners, including those who had been made by the Magyars and purchased from them. Soon, however, the unsatisfactory completion of this contract gave him an excuse to break the peace, and he defeated the Byzantine troops under the new commander of the Guards, Katakalos, at Bulgarophygos, not far from Adrianople. The Emperor Leo was so alarmed at the loss of his general that he even armed the Mohammedan prisoners of war then confined in Constantinople. The peace now concluded between the Bulgarians and Greeks lasted until the death of the Byzantine emperor in 911.

Symeon who assumed the title of Bulgarian Tsar in 917, employed the years of peace in stimulating literary movements. Educated in Constantinople, he was a zealous scholar of Christian literature, and did his best to bring home the new teaching to his people. The reign of the Tsar Symeon forms the closing age of the early

**Early
Bulgarian
Literature**

Slavonic Bulgarian literature, which is confined to ecclesiastical writings. The Bishop Constantine, the Pope Gregory, John Exarch, the monk Chrabr, and other authors at Symeon's magnificent court, raised ecclesiastical literature to a height that justifies comparison with the Latin and Greek literature of the period, and also extended it from Bulgaria to Servia and Russia. At the command of the Tsar, theological works and translations from

the Greek were composed. Surrounded by scholars, he found time himself for literary activity; to him is ascribed the translation of a whole collection of homilies of John Chrysostom.

In the year 912, Symeon's peaceful work was interrupted. The Emperor Leo had died, and his successor Alexander went out

Bulgaria's Triumph over Byzantium of his way to insult the messengers of Symeon when they requested a renewal of the peace. Alexander did

not feel the weight of Symeon's revenge, which was reserved for his successor, Constantine VII. Porphyrogenetos; notwithstanding the help of the Magyars, Servians, and Arabs, the battle of Mesembria ended with the defeat of the Byzantines on August 20th, 917. With the exception of Constantinople and some parts of the seaboard, almost the whole of the peninsula fell into the hands of the Bulgarians. About the same time the Serbs also came under Symeon's supremacy; with the support of Michael Wysevyt (912-926), the prince of the Southern Serbs, or Zachlumians, he imprisoned and executed their high Zupan, Peter, whose policy favoured the Byzantines, and set up Paul, a relative of the murdered man, as his successor in 917.

In 919 the Byzantine emperor, who was distinguished for scholarship rather than for political capacity, appointed his field-marshal Romanus Lakapenos as co-regent against Symeon's will. In 923 Symeon appeared before the gates of the capital and began negotiations for the necessary naval assistance with the Fatimid Fadlun of Kairuan, and captured Adrianople. It was only anxiety with regard to the Pechenegs and Magyars in the north that induced him to conclude peace at the personal request of the Roman.

While Symeon was occupied with Byzantium, the Servian Zupan, Paul, whom he had set up, was aiming at independence. Symeon sent an army to Servia, deposed

The Greatest Tsar of the Bulgarians Paul, and handed over the principality to a certain Zacharias in 923; he, however, also entered into rela-

tions with the Byzantines, and was therefore forced to flee from Symeon to Croatia. Symeon was unable to realise his plan of bringing Croatia under his supremacy, owing to the defeat in the year 927 of his field-marshal Alpbagatur. He died on May 27th, 927, the greatest Tsar of the Bulgarians, at once a general,

a scholar, and the first pioneer of European culture.

Symeon's carefully constructed state fell to ruins under his son Peter (927-969). Under his government the decline of the newly formed state of Old Bulgaria was accelerated by foes within and without. Symeon had left four sons. Michael, the son of his first marriage, had been confined in a monastery to secure the throne to Peter; the latter had two other brothers, John, and Boyan, who was popularly supposed to be a magician. The Byzantines, Magyars, Servians and Avars were only awaiting an opportunity to humiliate the youthful Tsar. Hard pressed on every side, Peter contracted a marriage on September 8th, 927, with Maria, the grand-daughter of the Emperor Romanus, in order to secure the peace of his kingdom with the help of the Greeks.

This step, however, was destined to be fatal to Bulgaria. With the entry of the first Byzantine Tsarina, East Roman influence began to take hold of Bulgarian politics, an influence destined to produce unlimited disaster in the following centuries. Greek tendencies now made them-

The Fatal Influence of the Greeks selves felt both in Church and state. The older strain of the Bulgarian people, the comrades in arms of the Tsar Symeon,

were dissatisfied with the new state of affairs and joined the younger brother John. However, the revolt was soon suppressed with the help of Byzantine troops; John was taken to Constantinople, was overwhelmed with presents by the Emperor Romanus, and was married to a noble Armenian woman. After a short time the monk Michael, Symeon's eldest son, also revolted, and placed himself at the head of the malcontents in 929. However, he died before he was able to drive the Byzantine courtiers out of the country.

The continual opposition to Byzantine misgovernment, which was always smouldering at the court of the Tsar, broke out into flame in 963, when the boyar Sisman revolted against the weak government, and after a short struggle secured the western provinces of Macedonia and Albania. The Serbs also broke away from Bulgaria, and constant plundering raids upon the country were made by the Magyars and the Turkish nomad people of the Pechenegs. Meanwhile, however, Peter carried on a luxurious life amid his Greek relations and courtiers.

THE OLD BULGARIAN KINGDOM

Under the government of this good-natured and cultured ruler the intellectual life of the Bulgarians was exposed to severe attacks. A few years after the introduction of Christianity into Bulgaria, a special form of opposition made itself felt among the people to the teaching of the state Church, which began to decay under the influence of the pedantry and preciousness of Byzantine literature; while this opposition was based upon old religious traditions, it was specially drawn to the teaching of a new sect. The not

to Thrace, to act as frontier guards, and a persecution initiated by Basil about 870 can only have increased their numbers.

In the first half of Peter's reign the Pope Bogumil appeared in Bulgaria; he was also known as Jeremias, and came forward as the reformer of the Paulician doctrine. His teaching was merely a new stage in the steady development of a doctrine formed by the mixture of Syrian, Persian, and Greek theories with fragments of Christianity; it was marked by a gradual conformation to Christianity, though at the same time the remnants of the old heathen cosmogony, derived from the Ugrian religion, were not cast away.

According to the traditions of the Ugrians, God created the world with the help of Satan, who eventually desires to secure the chief power for himself. From this division proceed the good and the evil principles. According to Bogumil, the good divinity was a perfect Triune being, the creator of the perfect and unseen world, inhabited by spiritual beings; while the bad divinity, Satan, or the devil, created the visible changeable world, the cosmos animate or inanimate. The opposition arising from this contrast between matter and spirit exists, according to the moral philosophy of the Bogumiles, only in the soul of man. "The soul is an angel fallen from heaven, imprisoned in the body, which will return to its former home after the last death." Besides the Scriptures, the Bogumiles had many other writings, which, together with their preaching, they spread over the whole



TENTH CENTURY PICTURE OF A BULGARIAN ROUT

This crudely drawn illustration appears in colour in an ancient Slavonian manuscript in the Vatican Library, and represents a cavalry skirmish in the tenth century between Russians and Bulgarians, the latter being routed.

inconsiderable survivals of the heathen Ugrian popular mythology and cosmogony, faded remnants of which still exist in those districts, formed the basis for the development in Bulgaria of the sect of the Bogumiles, whose dualist doctrine was at the outset in harmony with the spirit of the nation. Bogumilism began its career on the Balkan Peninsula with the settlement of the Armenian Paulicians; in 746 Constantine V. Kopronymos had transported a large number of them from Syria

of Europe. Bogumil himself made a collection of apocryphal writings, which were counted among the sacred books by his adherents. His gloomy doctrine, which pronounced the damnation of all animate nature, dominated the minds of the masses, whereas the nobility clung more closely to the powerful Eastern Church.

This intellectual movement brought mischief enough upon the Tsar Peter. In the year 963 the imperial throne of Byzantium was ascended by Nicephorus II.

Phocas; at his secret instigation the Russian prince Svjatoslav invaded Bulgaria in August, 968, and devastated the country with the support of the Byzantines. The nobility joined the Greeks, while the common people, whose minds were clouded by the teaching of Bogumil, resigned themselves to quiet neutrality.

A Deathblow to Old Bulgaria

Nicephorus, however, soon perceived that he had brought a dangerous enemy into his own neighbourhood in the shape of the Russians, and secured a peace, which was to have been confirmed by the double marriage of two Byzantine princes with Bulgarian princesses. Peter also sent his sons, Boris and Romanus, to Constantinople to be educated. He himself enjoyed this doubtful peace only for a short time; he died on January 30th, 969, leaving his tottering throne to his son Boris II.

Attracted by the prosperity of the Danube districts, Svjatoslav invaded the country with his Russians for the second time in the summer of 969, took the title of Tsar, and established himself in the country; this was a deathblow to Old Bulgaria, after an existence of three hundred years. In 971 the new Byzantine emperor, John Tzimisce, freed Bulgaria from the Russians, but incorporated it with the Byzantine Empire. Boris II. was forced to abdicate, and his younger brother Romanus was made a eunuch.

Western Bulgaria alone continued an independent existence under Sisman I., who had secured his independence under the Tsar Peter in 963. He left behind him four sons; of these his successor, the Tsar David, fell in battle against the nomad Wallachians, while Moses lost his life in an attack upon Seres; the third son, Aaron, was executed by the orders of his youngest brother, Samuel. Samuel now ascended the throne of Western Bulgaria, and retained it for almost four decades,

amid great confusion (976-1014). His domestic policy was guided by one great principle, to avoid arousing the hostility of the Orthodox Church, which was pre-eminent in the country and enjoyed the support of the powerful Boyars, or of the Roman Church, which had conferred the Tsar's crown upon him.

After the death of the Emperor Tzimisce (976), the throne of Byzantium was ascended by two youths of the family of

Basil I., the brothers Basil II. and Constantine VIII.; revolts thereupon broke out in every corner of the wide empire. This induced the Tsar Samuel to liberate the Bulgarians in Moesia, who had been hastily subdued, and to restore the kingdom of Symeon to its former boundaries. However, Basil II., who was a cruel ruler, notwithstanding his monastic mode of life, had made it his object, immediately upon entering upon his government, to bring about the complete subjugation of the Bulgarians. Samuel invaded Thrace and marched upon Thessaly and Hellas, devastating the country as he went. A battle was fought on the Isker between Ichtiman and Simokov in 981, at Stopenian; Basil himself had the utmost difficulty in escaping to Philippopolis.

A peace of fifteen years succeeded, partly interrupted by a fruitless attempt to besiege Sofia (987). Meanwhile Samuel conquered the coasts of the Adriatic and made the Servian prince, John Vladimir, his vassal. In the year 996 a second war broke out against Basil II., and on this occasion the Bulgarian army was annihilated on the banks of the Spercheus. In the following years the Byzantines occupied the Bulgarian country without striking a blow. Only the fortress of Pernik, or Perinograd, on the Struma, held out in 1002 as vigorously as afterwards in 1016.

The result was that at the outbreak of the last war Samuel was in possession only of Western Macedonia, Albania, and the environs of Sofia. In the south of the passes of Klidion and Kimbalongon his army was annihilated on July 29, 1014, on the Belasitza mountain. The Tsar escaped with difficulty to Prilep. Basil II. put out the eyes of all his Bulgarian prisoners, gave every hundred of them a one-eyed man as a guide, and thus allowed them to return home. Samuel was unable to bear up under this heavy blow, and died suddenly on September 15th, 1014.

Under Samuel's son and successor, Radomir, the Greeks again invaded Bulgaria. In 1015 Radomir was murdered while hunting by his cousin John Vladislav, probably at the instigation of the Emperor Basil II. The negotiations for peace set on foot by the murdered man led to no result, and Basil declined to abandon his object. A fresh army invaded Bulgaria. In the spring of 1018, John Vladislav fell in battle before Durazzo. After a short

THE OLD BULGARIAN KINGDOM

and desperate struggle, his son Fruzin surrendered, and was appointed commander of the court guards.

From the year 1018 onwards Bulgaria, for fully 150 years, no longer formed an obstacle to the expansion of the Byzantine Empire, which had never been more powerful in the Balkan Peninsula since the time of Marcian, Leo I., and Justinian I. The work of the great Symeon had been destroyed. Most of the Boyars were given posts at the Byzantine court by Basil. Katharina, a daughter of John Vladislav, and the last Tsarina Maria lived in Constantinople as ladies of the court, while high military posts were given to the Sismanid princes. The Bulgarian Church retained its independence, but its supreme head was no longer to be called patriarch, but archbishop. The country was divided into districts or themata, each under the government of a strategus; as these officials usually occupied their posts only for a year, they did their best to exhaust the wealth of their respective provinces with all speed. After the death of Basil

Struggles with the Turks II. the East Roman Empire entered upon a period of decay. Peter Deljan, supposed to be the son of the unfortunate Radomir, escaped from captivity and was welcomed by the nation as Tsar in 1040. At the same time the Slavs at Durazzo proclaimed the warrior Tichomir as Tsar; however, he was soon deposed and stoned to death by the people. Deljan, as sole ruler, then undertook an expedition against Thessalonica, where Manuel Ibatzes, the chamberlain of the Emperor Michael IV., went over to the Bulgarians with the army and the imperial treasury. Epirus and Hellas, weary of the extortions of the Strategis, joined Deljan. He, however, unfortunately appointed Alusian, the younger brother of John Vladislav as co-regent in September, 1040, and by way of thanks was drugged and blinded by him on July 3rd, 1041, and sent to Byzantium. For this reason the Bulgarian revolt came to an end in December of the same year.

Immediately afterwards (1048-1053) Bulgaria became the scene of dreadful struggles with the pure Turkish race of the Pechenegs, or Patzinaks, who had long before embraced the Mohammedan faith; they had been driven out of their steppes from the Lower Danube to the Crimea by

the kindred race of the Cumanians, and had established themselves on each side of the Balkans shortly before 1048. On the further side eleven tribes were settled, about 80,000 in number, under their khan Tirach, while two tribes, amounting to 20,000 heads, had accepted baptism under their chief Kegen, received settlements in

Converting the Barbarians the Dobrudza, and joined the Byzantines, at the end of 1048, in conquering their relatives on the other side of the Danube. The prisoners were settled by Constantine IX. Monomachos in the valleys of the western mountain district, in those of Sofia and Nis, and in Northern Macedonia. Some of them were also employed as mercenaries in Asia Minor, and in 1073 and 1086 they gave their support to Bulgarian revolts against Byzantium and the Dobrudza. It was not until April 29th, 1091, that the Byzantine armies, after suffering a series of defeats, were victorious at the battle of Lebunion, and with the help of the Cumanians were able to put an end to the devastations caused by the savage Pechenegs. During the Byzantine supremacy the sect of the Bogumiles developed a wholly unexpected vigour. Notwithstanding the repeated and cruel persecutions instituted by different emperors, the Bogumil doctrine spread westwards by way of the Byzantine settlements in Lower Italy. In Germany the adherents of this belief were known as Cathari, in Italy and Bosnia as Patarenes, in France as Albigenses. In opposition to the unlimited dualism of former times, to which the Macedonians clung tenaciously, a second party rose in Bulgaria during the military confusion of the tenth century, which was marked by a belief in a moderate form of monotheism, and explained the existence of Satan, not as a primordial being, but as a fallen angel. The Bogumil belief is of great importance in the history of human civilisation; it is, moreover, a

Far-off Dim Beginnings of the Reformation very remarkable phenomenon that such a religious movement, originating on Bulgarian soil, should have acquired influence over the people of Western Europe. The struggle initiated by this doctrine against the Roman priesthood eventually led to liberation from the papal oppression. In this respect the Bulgarian Bogumil doctrine contained the germs of the movement that was to develop into the great Reformation.



THE LATER BULGARIAN KINGDOM AND THE TURKISH SUPREMACY

WHILE Bulgaria was exposed under the Greek yoke to disruptive forces both internal and external, the Byzantine Empire was also tottering to its fall. The Cumanians were established in the Danube territories, the islands and the shores of the Ægean Sea were devastated by the Normans and Saracens, while in Asia Minor

Revolt Against the Greek Yoke

the empire was threatened by the Seljuk power. When the Emperor Isaac II. Angelus desired to enter upon a marriage with Margareta, the daughter of the Hungarian king, Bela (1172-1196), his plans were checked by want of money. Fresh taxes were imposed, and the Bulgarians and Wallachians in particular were subjected to oppressive extortion.

The dissatisfied parties were led by two brothers of an old Boyar family, Peter and Johannes Asen. John was crowned Tsar of the Bulgarians and Greeks in 1186, and an archbishop independent of the patriarch of Constantinople was set up in Tirnovo. The rebels were scattered by the Byzantines after some battles, and their leaders were forced to take refuge beyond the Danube with the Cumanians; but in 1187 Asen appeared in alliance with the revolted party at home. In the year 1187 the Byzantines had recovered the corpse of St. John or Ivan of Rila, who died in 946, a costly relic, which Bela had carried off to Gran from Serdica, or Sofia, in 1183; in 1188 they succeeded in capturing the Bulgarian Tsarina by treachery, and an armistice was concluded. On April 10th, 1195, Isaac was overthrown by his own brother Alexius III. and blinded, when the campaign against the Bulgarians once more ended without result. However, in the midst of his career, Asen I., who had made Tirnovo his capital, was killed in his palace in 1196 by the Boyar Ivanko, a mountain chieftain of Kricim in Rhodope (1195-1200); he called himself Alexius, and married the Greek princess, Theodora. Peter now took over the government in conjunction with his youngest brother,

Kalojan; but he also was murdered after a short time by one of his compatriots.

In alliance with the Cumanians, Kalojan, or Joannis (1197-1207), made annual invasions into Thrace and Macedonia, where he supported the revolt of the Boyar Dobromir Strez, who wrested the highland of Vardar from the Byzantine Empire in 1199. In 1201 the Byzantines were obliged to conclude peace with Kalojan, and to leave in his power the districts he had conquered. The Bulgarian Empire, restored by this means, extended under his government from Belgrade to the Lower Marica and to the Black Sea, from the mouths of the Danube to the Strymon. This frontier was disturbed by the Hungarian king, Emerich (1196-1204). Although Kalojan induced the Cumanians to devastate the territory of the Servian prince, Vukan, who was independent of Hungary, none the less the Hungarians captured from him five bishoprics in Lower Moravia.

With the object of confirming his royal title abroad, Kalojan, in 1202, applied to Pope Innocent III. requesting a grant of the title of emperor, and of a patriarch for his kingdom independent of Constantinople. In return Bulgaria was willing to submit definitely to the papal supremacy. Innocent III. sent Cardinal Leo of Santa Croce to Bulgaria in 1203; he crowned Kalojan on November 8th, 1204, with the royal diadem, after consecrating the Archbishop Basil of Tirnovo as primate of Bulgaria on the previous day. Kalojan accepted the kingly crown, but afterwards invariably styled himself Tsar (Cæsar), and arbitrarily altered the title of Primate to that of "Patriarch." This union of Bulgaria and Rome had no influence upon worship or doctrine.

Meanwhile, Kalojan's position had been entirely altered by the overthrow of the Byzantine Empire by the Latins. Count Baldwin of Flanders was crowned emperor in the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople.

THE LATER BULGARIAN KINGDOM

Numerous petty kingdoms appeared in the Balkan peninsula. Kalojan's position became more dangerous every day. He was cunning enough to offer a treaty of peace to Baldwin, but the proposal was haughtily rejected by the Frank. An opportunity for a counter stroke was afforded Kalojan by the revolt of the Greek population, who offered him the imperial crown. In alliance with the Cumanians, Kalojan occupied Adrianople, and there fought a decisive battle on April 14th or 15th, 1205, with the advancing Baldwin; the Latin emperor and his army were utterly defeated. However, for thirteen months (1205-1206) the Duke of Philippopolis, Renier de Trit, held out at Stanimaka against the overwhelming forces of the enemy. Kalojan was murdered in 1207; he was one of the greatest princes of Bulgaria, notwithstanding his cruelty.

Boris II. (1207 to 1218), a nephew of Kalojan, seized the Bulgarian throne in Tirnovo, and married the widowed tsarina. The legitimate heirs to the throne, the sons of Asen, John Asen and Alexander, fled to Russia. The great empire which Kalojan had acquired and maintained with his strong hand entered upon its decline. **Boris the Usurper** Boris possessed his uncle's lust for conquest, but not his great generalship or his statesmanlike forethought. He became entangled in war with the Franks, who were now in possession of the greater part of the old Byzantine Empire, and was utterly defeated by the Emperor Henry at Philippopolis on July 31st, 1208; he then confined his attention entirely to the suppression of disturbances at home.

The Bogumil doctrine had obtained so firm a hold on men's minds that the people, weary of continual war and oppression, longed for peace and quiet. The Tsar's plans of conquest were opposed even by the court circles. Boris had rightly recognised the reason for the fact, and assembled a synod of clergy in Tirnovo on February 11th, 1211. The synod pronounced an anathema upon the Bogumil doctrine, and translated a legal code, written against its adherents, from the Greek; the best known adherents of the doctrine were imprisoned or banished at Boris's command. In 1213 the Emperor Henry, abandoned by all his allies, agreed to a marriage with Boris's daughter Maria, in the hope that the Bulgarian prince would support him in a campaign against the Serbs. Boris certainly equipped an auxiliary force, but was forced to send it against John

Asen, who had returned from Russia, and had collected a large following. The result was that Boris was taken prisoner and blinded in 1218; the Emperor Henry had died at Thessalonica two years previously.

John Asen II., one of the noblest characters of his time, now ascended the Bulgarian throne as tsar (1218-1241).

A Great Prince Comes to His Own

His memory as a humane and politic governor still survives among the nation. The Byzantine Georgios Akropolita, who died in 1282, relates of him that all his contemporaries regarded him as a remarkable and fortunate man; "He never turned his arms upon the people at home for their destruction or stained his reputation by the murder of the Greeks, as his predecessors among the Bulgarian rulers had been wont to do. Hence he was beloved, not only by the Bulgarians, but also by the Greeks and other peoples." His efforts were directed chiefly to raising the prosperity of his country rather than to conquest; yet under his rule Bulgaria acquired an amount of territory which it never possessed either before or afterwards. A special case in point is the acquisition of the important Byzantine frontier fortress Beroë. The shores of Asen's kingdom were washed by three seas. Once again, for the first time since the days of the Tsar Samuel, all the Bulgarian Slavs were reunited under one rule; this continued until 1230. About 1220 Asen II. married Maria, the daughter of Andreas II. of Hungary, and attempted to secure the existence of his kingdom both at home and abroad by various peaceful means, especially by prudent marriages of his daughters.

Meanwhile a new state had arisen in the Pindus territory between the Gulf of Corinth and the Marica, founded by Theodore Angelus, the ruler of Epirus; within a short period he conquered Achrida, Prilep, Pelagonia, Durazzo, Corfu (1215), and Thessalonica, and in 1222 styled himself henceforward "Emperor of the Romaioi." Asen concluded a compact with Theodore, to whose brother Manuel he gave, about 1225, his illegitimate daughter Maria to wife. Notwithstanding the relationship thus brought about, Theodore soon attempted to conquer the kingdom of Asen. A decisive battle was fought in April, 1240, at the village of Klokotnica, between Philippopolis and Adrianople, where Theodore was defeated and taken prisoner

Statesmanship of the Great John Asen II.

Adrianople, with almost the whole of Macedonia and Albania as far as Durazzo, fell into the hands of the conqueror. He set up his own son-in-law, Manuel, who now assumed the title of emperor in the remnants of the kingdom of Epirus and in Thessalonica. He secured the obedience of the Servian king, Stefan Vladislav, by giving

The Making of a Beautiful Capital

him one of his daughters to wife in 1231. After thus securing peace, John Asen II. devoted his entire attention to the internal organisation of his kingdom. By his splendid buildings he transformed his capital into one of the most beautiful towns in the whole peninsula. In 1231 he rebuilt the fortress of Cepelarska Reka at Stenimachos, the Bulgarian inscription upon which was defaced some two centuries ago by Greek "patriots." He supported trade and commerce by conferring extensive privileges not only upon natives, but also upon foreigners, especially the people of Ragusa, who then had the whole carrying trade of the Balkan peninsula in their hands. To secure the recognition and the independence of the Bulgarian Church by the Greeks he concluded an alliance in 1234 with the Emperor John III. Dukas Vatatzes of Nicæa against the Latin Empire, and arranged a marriage between his nine-year-old daughter Helena and Theodore (the second Lascaris), the son of Vatatzes, who was eleven years of age.

The allies now devastated the country as far as Constantinople, although Asen was excommunicated in consequence by Pope Gregory IX. on May 25th, 1236. When, however, Asen recognised the growing power of his ally, he suddenly broke off the alliance with Vatatzes and brought home the daughter he had betrothed to Theodore. Irritated by the tolerance which Asen showed to the Bogumiles, and spurred on by the Latin

Hungarians Attack the Bulgarians

Emperor Baldwin II., who was still a minor, Gregory IX. commanded King Bela IV. to begin a crusade against Asen on February 27th, 1238. The Hungarians were able to occupy Wallachia Minor, and Bela assumed the title of King of Bulgaria and Cumania.

A new wave of migration then advanced. The Cumanians, driven out of their habitations by the Mongols, who were advancing from Russia, fled in seven tribes, partly

to Hungary, partly to the friendly state of Bulgaria, and partly to Thrace in Asia Minor, where settlements were assigned to ten thousand of them as military colonists by Vatatzes. One fragment only, which formed the nucleus of the mixed people of the Nogai Tartars, remained in their old home. Moldavia, Wallachia, and the northern shore of the Sea of Azov were for a long time known as Cumania. In the year 1239 Asen, strengthened by the Cumanians, marched upon Thrace, to capture the Greek citadels. There, however, he received the news of the death of his wife and son in Tirnovo of a plague, and he returned home. In the year 1240 Asen married Irene, the daughter of the Epirot Emperor Theodore Angelus, whom he had kept in confinement and had shortly before blinded; however, he died in June, 1241.

Under the successor of John Asen, Kaliman I. 1241-1246, who was a minor, the Tartars returned from Croatia and Russia by way of Servia and Bulgaria, their steps being marked by continual devastation. Kaliman died very suddenly,

The Throne Becomes Weaker

probably from poison. The former ally of John Asen, the Emperor Vatatzes of Nicæa, immediately seized the whole country of Rhodope and Northern Macedonia, while Michael II. of Epirus occupied Albania and Western Macedonia. The brother of Kaliman, Michael Asen, who was also a minor (1246-1257), could make no head against Vatatzes and concluded peace with him. In 1254 Perusia also fell, shattered by the Byzantine siege engines. Vatatzes died on October 30th, 1254, and was succeeded by his son, Theodore II. Lascaris, who had married Helena, the daughter of John Asen.


Michael Asen attempted to wrest the territory he had lost from his brother-in-law in 1246, but in 1256 was forced to conclude peace and to leave all the Bulgarian possessions in Rhodope and Macedonia to the Byzantines. The Bulgarian throne became weaker and weaker. In the year 1257 Michael Asen was overthrown by his cousin Kaliman II.; he, however, died unexpectedly shortly afterwards.

The Boyars now chose the Serb Constantine as tsar (1258-1277); he was a grandson of Stefan Nemanja, and possessed extensive territory in Bulgaria. He had married Irene, the grand-daughter

THE LATER BULGARIAN KINGDOM

of John Asen and took the name of Constantine Asen. During his government Michael VIII. Palæologus captured Constantinople in the summer of 1261 and put an end to the Frankish dominion. At that time the Tsar Constantine was forced to turn his attention to Hungary. Between 1260 and 1264 Prince Stefan, who had been entrusted with the administration of Transylvania, undertook five campaigns against the Bulgarians and withdrew to the frontier walls of Tirnovo; though he did not definitely occupy the country, still he assumed the title "King of Bulgaria" when he ascended the throne of Hungary as Stefan V. (1270-1272).

Constantine then happened to break a limb and fell seriously ill, with the result that his movements were impeded. The consequent inactivity of the Tsar proved fatal to Bulgaria. Maria Palæologa, the second wife of Constantine, who was acting as regent for her young son Michael, "born in the purple," took the power for herself in 1277. With a view to checking her most dangerous rival, the half independent despot Jacob Svetslav, a descendant of the Russian family who had been established by Stefan V. in the Western Balkans, she invited him to Tirnovo, and recognised him at a solemn service as her "son," who was to be henceforward



CITADEL AND PALACE OF THE MEDIAEVAL KINGS OF BULGARIA AT TIRNOVO
The picturesque stronghold of Tirnovo, or Trnovo, remained the capital of the Bulgarian kingdom till the year 1393.

After the death of Irene Lascaris, the wife of Constantine, in 1270, the tsar married Maria, the niece of Michael VIII., in 1272. When he failed to obtain possession of her dowry, the towns of Mesembria and Anchialos, he entangled the Byzantine ruler in a war, which might have proved serious for East Rome had it not been for the interference of Nogai Khan, a chieftain of the "Golden Horde." Michael VIII. was the more ready to begin negotiations for peace as his allies, the Albanians of Berat (1273), had deserted, in pursuance of their Angevin policy, and a far more dangerous enemy had arisen in the person of the Angevin Charles I. of Naples, who rapidly found allies in Serbia and Bulgaria.

co-regent with her own son Michael. However, in the same year, 1277, Svetslav lost his life through the intrigues of his "mother."

The Nogai Tartars again invaded the defenceless kingdom; thereupon Haiduk **The "Prophet"** Ivajlo Lachanas—also known as Brdoka—originally a shepherd, played upon the minds of the people by his prophecies, gathered a band of compatriots, and twice defeated the Tartars. He soon announced that the saints had appointed him to the throne of Bulgaria. The hard-pressed people believed him, and Boyars, and even courtiers, were numbered among his adherents. The Tsar Constantine rose from his sick-bed and marched upon him

with those who remained faithful; but Constantine's forces were scattered, and he himself was slain without being able to strike a blow in the winter of 1277. Ivajlo now ascended the Bulgarian throne as Tsar (1277-1279). These proceedings in Bulgaria had roused the greatest anxiety at the Byzantine court. The Emperor Michael hastily married his daughter Irene to a member of the family of the Asenids, who then raised a claim to the Bulgarian crown as John Asen III. Meanwhile the intriguing Maria celebrated her union with Ivajlo, and had herself crowned together with him in 1278. Attacked simultaneously by the Mongols and Byzantines, Ivajlo was unable to maintain his position, and disappeared at the beginning of 1279.

Maria, who was with child by the usurper, was sent into confinement at Adrianople. John Asen III., a feeble and subservient character, entered upon the government, while the people supported the Boyar George Terterii, who was descended from a noble Cumanian family, and related to the most powerful families of Bulgaria. With the object of securing the support of this dangerous rival, Asen III. gave him his daughter in marriage; the "Despot" Terterii was forced to send his former wife to Bulgaria and his son Svetslav—the Slav name will be observed—to Nikaia as hostages. At that point Ivajlo, who was supposed to be dead, suddenly appeared with a large following before the gates of Tirnovo. The Emperor Michael VIII. sent two armies in the summer of 1280 to the help of his hard-pressed son-in-law, but both were annihilated. Asen III. fled to Constantinople; George Terterii I. was crowned Tsar in 1280. Ivajlo fled to the south of Russia to seek help from Nogai Khan. There he met his old and unrelenting enemy John Asen III. Nogai Khan amused himself for a time by making empty promises to the rivals, until he finally beheaded Ivajlo.

Asen III. had some trouble in escaping the same fate. Charles I. of Naples found George Terterii I. a valuable help against the Byzantines. A French army, which landed on the Balkan peninsula and obtained Albanian reinforcements, was annihilated by the Greeks at Berat at the beginning of April, 1281. The Sicilian Vespers (March 30th, 1282) put an end to the further plan of Charles I. On December 11th, 1282, Michael VIII. died, and his successor, Andronicus II., concluded peace with the Bulgarian Tsar in 1248, for their common Mongolian enemy was once more threatening their frontiers. However, George Terterii was able to offer but feeble resistance to the attack of the Tartars; he was forced to conclude peace and to give one of his daughters to the son of Nogai Khan. None the less the hordes established themselves in the empire, and George Terterii was driven out of the country and imprisoned at Byzantium.

The Mongols now placed the Boyar Smilec, who had married the grand-daughter of Andronicus II., on the Bulgarian throne about 1292. Nogai Khan shortly afterwards fell in a battle against Toktu, the ruler of the "Blue Horde" in Western Kiptjak (1290-1312). His son Choki, who assumed that he had hereditary rights to Bulgaria as the stepson of Terterii, made an alliance with Theodore Svetslav, who had spent his childhood in Nikaia, and drove out Smilec. However, Svetslav captured the Tartar intruder unawares and had him strangled by Jewish executioners. His government (1295-1322) was at first by no means devoted to the works of peace. For three years he carried on

war with Byzantium and conquered some towns and fortresses on the Hæmus. Together with the tsar, his uncle Eltimir played an important part in the country as despot of Krun on the eastern slope of the Balkans. The Byzantine Empire was at this

Mongols
Dictators in
Bulgaria



THE BULGARIAN NATIONAL COSTUME

THE LATER BULGARIAN KINGDOM

time hard pressed on every side. Ertogrul, the leader of the Ottomans, had founded, about 1250, a small kingdom in Bithynia, which had been extended to the shores of the Propontis by his son Osman in 1310. The second half of the reign of Svetslav, which lasted almost twenty-eight years, was a time of peace at home and abroad; in 1320 he married a grand-daughter of the old Andronicus II.

After the death of Theodore Svetslav his son George Terterii II. ascended the Bulgarian throne in 1322. In that year he occupied Philippopolis, but in 1323 the town was lost by his Russian field-marshal Ivan, owing to the treachery of the Greek citizens, and fell into the hands of Andronicus the younger. In the same year the last descendant of Terterii died.

The Boyars now chose Michael as their Tsar (1323-1330); he was the half Cuman despot of Widdin, and was a son of Sisman; with him begins the third and last dynasty of the Bulgarian kingdom at Tirnovo, that of the Sismanids. At that time, 1327, civil war was raging between Andronicus III. and his grandfather the Emperor Andronicus II., who

The Power of Bulgaria is Broken borrowed 2,000 Cumans from Servia. The Tsar Michael, who, in 1325, had divorced his Servian wife Anna, and had married the widow of his predecessor, a sister of Andronicus the younger, joined first one and then another Andronicus with the object of capturing Constantinople, and thus realising the dream of the ancient Tsars. However, his plan did not succeed. Constantinople was conquered on May 24th, 1328, by Andronicus III., who deposed his grandfather, aged sixty.

To secure his kingdom for the future the Tsar Michael conceived the dangerous idea of destroying the neighbouring state, the rise of which threatened his existence. In alliance with the Byzantines, Tartars, and Wallachians he marched against Stefan Uros III. A decisive battle was fought on June 28th, 1330, at Velbuzd, at that time a Servian town. The Bulgarian army was defeated and Michael lost his life. The Servian king erected a church of the Ascension on the battlefield, and placed his sister Anna, Michael's divorced wife, and her son Sisman II. on the throne.

However, the real power of the Bulgarian kingdom was broken. Stefan Uros III. was taken prisoner and strangled, and

Stefan Dusan was crowned king on September 8th, 1331. Meanwhile the Bulgarian Boyars revolted against their Tsarina. Anna fled to Servia and Sisman II. to the Tartars, whence he travelled to Constantinople, and finally settled in Naples under the name of Louis, where he died in 1333. The Boyars then appointed John

Alliance with Servia Alexander as Tsar (1331-1365), a nephew of the Tsar Michael, and son-in-law of the Roumanian prince, Ivanko Barasab.

He took the surname of Asen, and married his sister Helena to Stefan Dusan, who had entered upon his government almost at the same time, and thus brought about an alliance between Servia, Bulgaria, and Bessarabia. While the Serbs overcame Macedonia, Albania, and Epirus, and the Roumanians defeated the Hungarians in the swamps of Wallachia in 1330, the Bulgarian Tsar forced the Byzantines to make peace, which was afterwards secured by a marriage between his son Michael and Maria, the daughter of Andronicus, in 1337. On June 15th, 1341, Andronicus III. died, and his son John V. Palæologus ascended the throne; the learned Viceroy, John VI. Cantacuzenos, set himself up as an opposition emperor. During a civil war in the Byzantine Empire the Tsar Alexander succeeded in considerably extending the boundaries of his state.

Meanwhile the downfall of the Byzantine Empire was accelerated by an alliance which the two conflicting emperors concluded with the individual Turkish princes, who were accustomed, under the title of "allies," to devastate every district into which they marched. At the end of 1353—a more correct date than that commonly current, 1356—the Turks for the first time gained a footing in Europe, at Tzympe on the Hellespont; in 1354 Kallipolis fell, and soon the Ottomans established themselves on the shores of the Marica.

Religious Dissensions and Degeneracy Not only was Bulgaria likely at any moment to fall a prey to the Asiatics, but her solidarity had also been

destroyed from within by religious dissension. In the monasteries on Mount Athos there sprang up among the monks about 1346 a special form of that mysticism whose adherents were known as Hesychastes or Quietists. The monks received instruction in Bogumilism from a nun named Irene, which became the occasion of more

or less disgraceful orgies. From these excesses a revival of the remnants of heathendom was brought about by the monk Theodoretus.

Theodoretus, who possessed some knowledge of medicine, secured a large following in Bulgaria. He revived early heathen customs, in particular the veneration of the

Heathen Customs Revived oak-tree, at the foot of which sheep and lambs were sacrificed. His medicinal treatment depended, in the first instance,

upon the sacrifice of victims for the purpose of appeasing the spirits of ill-health and inducing them to look favourably upon the patients. Almost at the same time two monks appeared in Bulgaria (Lazar and Cyril), who turned the Bogumil movement into more dangerous paths by their contempt for the saints and for the Cross, and by the scorn which they poured upon labour and marriage, while another monk disseminated the common Adamite heresy.

The Tsar John Alexander had also confined his wife in a monastery, and had made the Jewess Theodora his tsarina, in consequence of which Jews obtained special privileges. As the Turks on the further side of the Balkans were extending their possessions from day to day, while in Bulgaria the Bogumils, Hesychastes, Adamites, and Jews pursued their way without let or hindrance, the tsar summoned councils (1350-1355) in which the Bogumils, Hesychastes, and Adamites were condemned and the encroachments of the Jews were limited.

John Alexander Asen died in the spring of 1365 and left behind him a disunited kingdom tottering to its fall. His son John Sisman III. (1365-1393) reigned in Tirnovo, and another son of Alexander, John Strasimir, in Widdin, while the districts of Pontus were subject, until about 1386, to the Cumanian despot Dobrotic, who had inherited the estates of his brothers Balikis and Theodore.

An Empire Tottering to its Fall After the capture of Adrianople in 1361, and Philippopolis in 1363, Murad I. transferred his capital from Brusa to

"Edreneh." Danger, however, was also threatening from another quarter. Lewis I. of Hungary conquered Widdin in the summer of 1364, and carried Strasimir and his consort prisoners to Croatia; in the following year, 1366, Sisman attacked the new Hungarian province with the help of the Turks, but was beaten back. It

was not until 1369 that the Bulgarian Tsar succeeded in wresting Widdin from the Hungarians.

While the Christian rulers of the Balkan peninsula were at war with one another the newly founded Turkish state increased steadily year by year. Finally the Serb Wukashin, or Vlkasin, revolted, but his army was destroyed on the night of September 26th, 1371. Upper Macedonia was incorporated with the Ottoman Empire. The Servian dynasts were forced to serve in the Turkish army; Marko Kraljevic and Constantine of Velbuzd alone offered a temporary resistance to their new rulers. Ivanko, the son of Dobrotic, also held out about 1390 against the Ottoman advance.

In 1388 Sisman III. was forced to agree to the payment of an annual tribute. Almost at the same time Strasimir did homage to the Ottoman emir. His example was finally followed by the Kustendil despot, Constantine, the brother of John Dragas; he fell fighting against the Wallachians in 1394, and he is still remembered as the last Christian ruler of

The Turk Triumphs at Tirnovo Velbuzd, Kratovo, Strumica and Stip. Serbia was delivered up to Turkey as the result of a battle on the field of Amsel

on June 15th, 1389. Turkish efforts were now concentrated upon Bulgaria. The downfall of the country was secured by the fall of Tirnovo on July 17th, 1393; John Sisman III. probably died in a Turkish prison in the citadel of Philippopolis. Old Bulgaria ceased to be an independent state.

As the Bulgarians were destined to be the rulers of the Balkan peninsula, so they were also the founders of art and literature, which they communicated to the other Slav races. Through the teaching of a native creed, Bogumilism, they brought confusion into the whole of Southern Europe, then absorbed by the Byzantine culture, with its exaggeration and decay; this culture the Bulgarians too accepted with all its traditions, and in company with it they declined.

With the first Greek woman who ascended the Bulgarian throne, in 927, the first step was taken for the introduction of Greek civilisation into Bulgaria. This dangerous influence, however, affected only the upper classes, the Boyars, and the clergy in the towns; fresh streams of national feeling watered the growth of the Bulgarian peasantry, and without this there could

THE LATER BULGARIAN KINGDOM

have been no renaissance for Bulgaria. The interests of the dominant Boyar caste, and those of the people who were for the most part in a condition of serfdom, were naturally in diametrical opposition. Energetic tsars were generally hated by the Boyars, most of whom ruled their estates and their people exactly as they pleased. After the Ottoman invasion many Boyar families accepted Mohammedanism. This was rather a benefit to the body politic, in so far as the division between the Mohammedan nobility and the Christian people grew steadily wider; the lower classes, left to themselves, became a barrier against the extension of the Ottoman kingdom.

With the fall of the empire literary life also disappeared. Most of the work produced in the pre-Turkish period was lost. Bogumilism, however, performed the service of handing down to posterity, even under the Turkish supremacy, the written works of the Slav Church. One of the most important works of the Bogumils is said to have been "The Questions of St. John Bogoslav, which he put to the Lord on Mount Tabor." Side by side with the description of the end of the world they composed a cosmogony in which the old heathen traditions of the Ugrians were accepted and fitted on to the Bogumil teaching; from Bulgaria the work passed to Russia and Servia and to France and Italy in the Latin translation of Nazarius, a bishop of Upper Italy.

Other works ascribed to St. John were also popular. Such were "Questions concerning Adam and Abraham on the Olberg" and a "Sermon upon the Mother of God," also the apocryphal "Journey of the Mother of God in Hell," the "Story of the Twelve Fridays," the "Histories of Daniel and Samson," and a tractate on "Bad Wives," which was incorporated in the collection of the Tsar Symeon. Besides these religious works numerous romances and fairy tales of Greek, Arabic and Indian origin were widely disseminated, and were transmitted to the Slavs by Bulgarian translations. The life of Alexander the Great, the Legend of Troy, the Indian tales of the Panchatantra were widely known among the Slavs in Bulgarian translations. These religious and secular novels formed the intellectual pabulum of the Slavs in

those centuries, not only of the upper classes, but in particular of the common people. The "Sborniks" (manuscript collections) give an accurate idea of the current literature of the Bulgarians; together with fragments from Byzantine theological literature, they contain numerous apocryphal writings, fairy tales, histories of miracles, legends and essays on secular subjects. In the days of serfdom the Sborniks affected the popular mind so strongly that many of these apocryphal stories and legends received the stamp of national literature and were incorporated with native songs and ancient traditions.

Of the historical literature of that period only a few essays and fragments have been preserved—as, for instance, "An Account of the Foundation of the Patriarchate of Bulgaria" (1235); a "pomenik" of deceased tsars, patriarchs, bishops and Boyars; a "Conspectus of Peoples and Languages," wherein the people are compared with animals (from the early part of the thirteenth century); a "List of Languages and Writings." Apart from these there are also two great compilations of popular origin, the "Legends of Alexander," and even some apocryphal books; one of these includes the downfall of Constantinople (1453). The greatest historical work is the chronicle of Constantine Manasses, carried down to 1078, which was translated at the orders of the Tsar John Alexander (1331–1365), in whose reign the reformer of the church discipline, Theodosii of Tirnovo, together with his disciples Dionysii and Euthymii, composed numerous lives of national saints and letters to the ecclesiastical princes. However, in the following three centuries more manuscripts were destroyed by the Ottomans than Bulgarian industry could replace. The darkest period in the history of the Bulgarian people is the age of the Turkish supremacy, from the end of the fifteenth century to the beginning of the national renaissance. Trade and commerce were in the hands of the Greeks, and the higher offices were almost all occupied by Mohammedans. The people existed only for the purpose of bearing the weight of taxation. Victories of the Austrian armies had aroused idle hopes in Bulgaria, and many of the inhabitants migrated in vain to the south

of Hungary. At no period, however, of the Turkish supremacy were men wanting to drive back the Turkish oppression by armed force and to continue their free life in the mountains. It was not so much robbery as revenge upon the oppressors of their co-religionists which was the life-work of these Haiduks, whose struggles and

Patriots who Lived to Kill the Turks adventures were immortalised in numerous songs, surviving even at the present day. They were knightly figures, impatient of servitude, who made it their profession to plunder and slaughter the Mohammedans, while protecting and supporting the Christians.

After the fall of the Bulgarian kingdom and of the national Church, which became wholly subject to the Greek Church, many of the Bogumils sought satisfaction for their animosity in Catholicism. Numerous Bogumils were converted by the Franciscans of Bosnia. These converts afterwards called themselves Paulicians—not to be confused with the older sect of that name—and emigrated for the most part to Roumania, Transylvania, and the south of Hungary. In the year 1688 the Emperor Leopold I. of Austria gave his support to a revolt of the Catholic Bulgarians of Ciporovci, which was, however, suppressed by the Turks; the population were driven out of their settlements and fled to Roumania. A few of them also reached Transylvania, and were settled in Deva and Alvincz. Others, again, who removed from Petikladenci at Nicopolis on the Danube in 1727 to Wallachia Minor, which was then an Austrian province, betook themselves in 1740 to the Banat of Temes in Southern Hungary, where they were known as Pavlikeni.

In 1762 the monk Paysii of Mount Athos wrote a small "Sloveno-Bulgarian History of the Bulgarian Peoples, Tsars and Saints," which has been of great importance in the modern development of the Bulgarian people. The enthusiastic patriotism which inspires every line of this little book found a ready response. A truly popular work, the "History of the Bulgarians," by Paysii, was widely disseminated in countless editions and revisions. His pupil, Stoiko, who was

afterwards Bishop of Vraca, under the name of Sofronii, continued the work of the national renaissance. The sentiments of patriotism, hatred of the Greeks, and contempt for the Turks are even more strongly marked in his writings than in those of his master. In 1802 he composed translations of Greek fables, narratives, and aphorisms. In his memoirs he drew an accurate picture of the age, about 1804. His chief work was his sermons, which, printed in 1806, formed the first book in the Bulgarian language, and for that reason is still popular.

In the year 1786 Bulgarian immigrants again appeared in Hungary, and settled for the most part in the county of Torontal. In their new home, these settlers in the mountain districts have retained their Bulgarian nationality in more or less complete purity to the present day, while the settlers in the lowlands have become a mixed people, and have adopted many of the characteristics of the Roumanians and Serbs. The fact that they have not entirely lost their characteristics amid the mixed people of their new home is largely due to the fact that, like the Balkan Bulgarians, they tenaciously clung to their ancient customs, a habit which survived the severest period of the Turkish supremacy. The custom of household

How National Customs Have Survived communism still connects the members of a family in a corporation in which the cleverest, and not necessarily the oldest, is spokesman, manages the common property, and distributes the labour and the profits of it among the members of the family. This feeling of corporate family life has, by its persistence, given to the Bulgarian character a certain narrowness of mind and a special theory of life which deals largely with facts as they are, cherishes no presumptuous dreams of future prosperity, and regards life from an eminently practical point of view. This theory of corporate family life is also apparent in the ancient marriage customs. It was in these scenes of patriarchal family life that those epic poems arose among the Bulgarians which immortalised the national heroes, the champions of freedom, and the Haiduks.

HEINRICH VON WŁISŁOCKI





THE ROUMANIAN PEOPLE

STRUGGLES OF THE WALLACHIAN KINGDOM

AN infinite number of different theories, both in scientific and in pseudo-scientific circles, have continually reappeared until recent times concerning the origin of the Roumanians, a nation which has settled in smaller groups in the Balkan territories in Hungary and Transylvania, and in a coherent body in the modern kingdom of Roumania. This people is known by the Slavs as Wlach, Walach, which nearly corresponds to the Germanic "Wahl" (Welsh). The Roumanian shepherds of the mountains of Dinai were distinguished from the Italian townspeople of Dalmatia as the "Black Vlachs." Like Italian, Spanish, and French, Roumanian has descended from popular Latin, of the kind spoken by the Romanised subjects of Rome during the first six centuries of our era on the Lower Danube and in ancient Dacia or Transylvania. Hence the name Daco-Roumanian, to distinguish this from the other Romance languages.

Language and Early History

For the period of the colonisation of Dacia by the Romans, the best descriptive material is to be found in the bas-reliefs of the Dacian war decorating the pillar of Trajan.

Early history must, on the whole, be regarded as having run something like the following course: the scanty native population of Daco-Thracian origin coalesced with numerous soldiers and colonists, whose popular Latin soon became individual in character, but in spite of all changes preserved its fundamental romance type. In the year 697, and to some extent a century earlier, the Finno-Ugrian Bulgarians migrated into the country, and preserved their Turanian language for three centuries before they were absorbed by the mixed peoples of the Balkan Peninsula; during that time, the influence which they exerted upon Albanian, mediæval Greek, etc., was naturally also extended to early Roumanian. Side by side with, and subsequent to, this influence we have to take into

account the strong and permanent influence of the Slav population.

The main dialect of the Roumanian language is spoken by about nine millions of people in Moldavia and Wallachia, in Bessarabia and Transylvania, in the Banat, in part of Hungary and Bukovina, and it alone possesses any literature; two subordinate dialects also exist —the South, or Macedonian, Roumanian of the Kutzo Wallachians, or Zingars, in Macedonia, Albania, Thessaly, and Epirus —amounting to about one million people—and the half Slav Istro-Roumanian, which is spoken by about 3,000 people in the neighbourhood of the East coast of Istria and in the interior of the Karst range side by side with the Croatian, which is the dominant language.

After the extensive settlements of Roman colonists by Trajan, the former land of Dacia for many decades occupied the position of a frontier territory, or outpost, of the Roman Empire; as that empire declined to its fall, the barbarians caused increasing disturbances, which only occasionally and for short periods gave way to a sense of security, as under the Emperor Maximian (235-238). Aurelian, the "Restorer of the Empire" (270-275), was forced to abandon the further bank of the Danube to the Goths, to transport the colonists over the stream, and to form a new Dacia on the south. From that period the districts to the north of the Lower Danube were invariably the object of the invading hordes of barbarians as they advanced to the south-west.

A Land Overrun with Barbarians

The Huns and Gepids about 450 were succeeded a century later by the Avars —about 555—and by the Slavs in different advances and attacks. Then in 679 came the Bulgarians (Khazars and Old Zingars), and after a hundred and fifty or two hundred years the Magyars, from about 840 to 860, whose

settlements, in parts at least, were only temporary.

Such fragments of Roman colonial civilisation as survived those stormy times were hard beset by the repeated raids of the Pechenegs about 900, and by the Cumanians, or Uzes, about 1050. It will be obvious that, in view of the disturbed

Highlands
the Refuge of
Nationality state of the country, no detailed chronology free from suspicion can be given. It can be observed, however, in the barest outline, that, apart from the numerous invasions of the barbarians, one striking exception is to be observed, consisting in certain scanty remnants of Germanic languages, Western Gothic and Gepid, while Slav and Ural Altaic, or North Mongolian, blood was infused into the Daco-Roumanian population that remained in the plains, Bessarabia, Dobrudza, and Wallachia. The pure Daco-Roumanian nationality may have survived in a fragmentary state among the inaccessible wooded mountains of North-west Moldavia and Transylvania, also in Dacia during the period of Aurelian; these elements may have left their highlands when the country was pacified or passed north of the Danube, and again have exerted a special influence upon the motley complexion of the nation now known as Roumanian.

During the tenth and eleventh centuries it is noticeable that similar principalities, or banats, were formed in Dacia, of which those advancing too far from Transylvania into the low lands of the Theiss fell under Magyar supremacy. On the other hand, the duchies which spread to the east and south of the Carpathian Mountains were able to maintain their ground against the Pechenegs, Cumanians, and Mongols. About the middle of the fourteenth century the two kingdoms of Wallachia and Moldavia began their existence, starting from the Carpathians and continuing for

Two Kingdoms
in the
Carpathians a long time in mutual independence with a history of their own. At the outset of the thirteenth century Wallachia was in the hands of the Hungarian kings of the house of Arpad. Bela IV. gave the country, in 1247, to the Knights of St. John, with the exception of the half Cumanian domain of the "Olacus" Seneslav, who was at that time Voivode of Great Wallachia to the east of the river Olt, and with the excep-

tion also of the jurisdiction of the Voivode Latovoi, who was almost independent. When Ladislaus IV., the Cuman, ascended the throne of Hungary in 1272, while yet a minor, Litovoi and his brother attempted to shake off the burdensome obligation of yearly tribute; but Litovoi was killed about 1275, and his brother Barbat was obliged to pay a high ransom. Shortly afterwards Basarab, a grandson of the above-mentioned Seneslav, founded to the west of the Olt the principality of "Transalpina" (Hungarian-Wallachia, or Wallachia Minor) with Arges as the capital. It should be observed that Moldavia, constitutionally a state of later date, in contrast to Wallachia or the "Roumanian territory" in general, is occasionally known as Wallachia "Minor," until it was overshadowed by the older neighbour state under Alexander the Good; under Stefan the Great it is sometimes known as Bogdania—in Moldavian, Mutenia. In contrast to Moldavia, which was formed chiefly by foreign immigrants, this principality is a state which developed from its own resources. The power of

Basarab
Master of
Roumania Basarab was considerably diminished by the defeat of his ally, Michael Tirnovu, at Velbuzd in 1330. However, the attempt of the Hungarian Angevin, Charles Robert I., to re-enforce a half-forgotten homage, became a total failure amid the wilderness of the Carpathian Mountains; Basarab, who died about 1340, remained master of the whole of "the Roumanian territory," which indeed became then, for the first time, the nucleus of a state in the proper sense of the word. However, this Wallachia Minor, which began its history with much promise, was soon overshadowed by Wallachia Major, and falls into the background.

Alexander, the son of Basarab, concluded an independent agreement with Lewis I. the Great at Kronstadt (1342-1382), concerning the conditions on which he held his position as voivode; however, in his own country his rule was largely disturbed by dissatisfied subjects. To his period belongs the foundation of a new principality in Moldavia, near Baia, by Bogdan. The affairs of the Balkan peninsula in his proximity induced Alexander to leave this ambitious rival in peace. In 1359 the Byzantine metropolitan, Hyacinthus, came from Vicina at the mouth of the Danube to Hungarian Wallachia as Exarch. By



A BEAUTIFUL AND HISTORIC CATHEDRAL OF ROUMANIA

This fine cathedral of Arges is the subject of various legends, but it was most probably founded by Basarab, who was founder of "Transalpina," with his capital at Arges, and died, in 1340, master of the whole of the "Roumanian Territory."

his first wife, probably a Servian or Bosnian woman, Alexander Basarab had a son, Layko, or Vladislav; afterwards, about 1350, he married a Roman Catholic, the Hungarian Clara, and died on November 16th, 1364.

Layko, who died in 1377 or between 1382 and 1385, was able to maintain his position against King Lewis; as early as 1369 he styled himself in his documents "Ladislaus by the Grace of God and the King of Hungary, Voivode of Wallachia, Ban of Syrmia, and Duke of Fogaras." Fogaras was a territory in Transylvania, afterwards granted as a fief to the Voivode of Wallachia by the kings of Hungary, as it was a secure refuge in the period of Turkish invasions, which began in 1367 and 1385. Under Layko, Arges became a Roman bishopric in 1369, although the conversion desired by the Pope was not accepted on the side of the voivode. In fact, his inclination to the Greek Church was plainly apparent in the marriage of the successor Radu with Kallinikia to whose influence is certainly

due the occurrence of more extensive ecclesiastical gifts.

The sons of this couple were the hostile brothers, Dan (ruler in October, 1385 and 1393) and Mircea the Old, or Great (1386-1418). In 1390 Mircea made a convention with the Polish king Vladislav Jagiello II., which was renewed in 1411. About 1391 he took Dobrudza and the town of Silistria from the Bulgarians. However, in 1389 he was defeated at Kossovo with his allies, and became a semi-vassal of the Ottomans in 1391 and 1394. With the object of protecting his country from the threatened advance of the Turks, Mircea came to Transylvania in 1395, and on March 7th, at Kronstadt, concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with King Sigismund, in accordance with the terms of which he fought with the Christian army in the unfortunate battle of Nicopolis, on September 28th, 1396. Mircea was, however, now forced to recognise once again the Turkish supremacy, to abandon entirely the right bank of the Danube to

the Ottomans, and to pay the emir a yearly tribute of 3,000 red bannes, or 300 silver Turkish dollars; the defiance shown by Mircea in withholding the tribute for three years was broken down in 1417.

In return the Porte guaranteed, in 1411, the free administration of the country under a voivode chosen by the inhabitants. This convention was to form the basis, even in the nineteenth century, of the relations of Wallachia with Turkey, and was renewed in 1460 between the Voivode Vlad IV. and Mohammed II., according to the common account. In the struggles for the succession which broke out in 1403 upon the death of Bajazet I. Mircea supported Musa, and met with his reward when the latter was recognised as ruler of the Ottoman kingdom in February, 1411. Hence the convention of 1411 may be regarded as a friendly alliance. However, this friendly relationship between Wallachia and the Porte was not to continue permanently. In 1413 Musa fell fighting against his brother Mohammed. The latter crushed the pretensions of the false Mustafa, who was also deceived by Mircea; he also punished the Roumanians in 1417 by subjugating their country—a process which even Jorga cannot avoid calling "complete." He may certainly be right in regarding the agreement for tribute concluded between Bajazet and Mircea as a falsification, like that between Mohammed II. and Radu the Fair. Concerning the amount of tribute we have no certain information before 1532.

In 1413 Mircea appointed his son Mihail co-regent, and himself died on January 31st, 1418; the two princes are represented together in a tolerably well-preserved fresco in the Byzantine style in the monastery of Cozia. Mihail also died in 1420, and was succeeded by his hostile

brother Dan, the protégé of the Turks, who disappears from the scene in 1430. The Boyar Aldea, known as Alexander, who was supported by Moldavia and Turkey, struggled to secure the throne for four years, 1432–1436, and was then driven out by Vlad, the legitimate son of Mircea, who had been brought up at the court of the emperor Sigismund.

During the reign of the haughty Voivode Vlad II., known as Drakul, or devil, a period of the greatest distress and poverty passed over the country. In 1432 he was driven out of his capital, Tirgoviste, while Turkish troops devastated the districts of Burzen and of the Székler; in 1436 he even fell into the hands of the Ottomans, but was eventually able to maintain his position in isolation. In the year 1438 he guided the army of Murad to Transylvania, and styled himself Duke of Fogaras and Amlas. After the battle of Szent-Endre in 1442, the leader of the Hungarian army, Janos Hunyadi, a Roumanian of Transylvania, marched into Wallachia and forced the

Turkish vassal, Vlad Drakul, to submit; in 1443 Vlad accompanied him to Servia.

This position of affairs was not, however, of long duration. The statement that he captured Hunyadi on his flight from the disastrous battle of Varna on November 10th, 1444, is questionable. However, the power of Hungary was so weakened that Vlad concluded a fresh peace with the Porte in 1446. This induced the Hungarian general to invade Wallachia at the end of 1446 and to confer the dignity of voivode on Vladislav, who styled himself Dan IV. Vlad Drakul was defeated at Pegovist, taken prisoner, and executed at Tirsor,

together with his son Mircea. For a long period the struggle for the dignity of prince continued between the families of Dan and Drakul. Partly as a consequence



MIRCEA: A GREAT WALLACHIAN KING
Mircea, king of Wallachia, and his son are here shown in an old mosaic. His life was spent largely in fighting the Turk, and had not the Ottoman power been so strong he would have founded a great and permanent kingdom, being a diplomatist as well as a warrior. He died in 1418. His son Mihail, who succeeded, died two years later.

STRUGGLES OF THE WALLACHIAN KINGDOM

of Hungarian help and partly with Turkish help the voivodes succeeded one another rapidly. Dan IV. supported Hunyadi in the middle of October, 1448. with 8,000 men, in the battle on the field of Amsel, but his personal indifference to the result was punished by the confiscation of his fiefs situated beyond the Carpathians.

From 1455 or 1456 until 1462 reigned Vlad IV., the second son of Drakul; he is sufficiently characterised by his nickname "the impaler." Immediately after the death of Hunyadi in 1456 and of Ladislaus Posthumus in 1457, Vlad made an unexpected invasion into Transylvania, reduced Kronstadt to ashes, and impaled all his prisoners. For the purpose of securing his rear, he concluded an alliance with the Porte in 1460, but in 1461 he surprised Bulgaria from pure lust of plunder and slaughter, and caused some 20,000 human beings to be impaled. To avenge this outrage the Turks marched against him in the spring of 1462 in conjunction with Stefan the Great of Moldavia, and drove him into Transylvania. The Alibeg of the Ottoman Emir, Mohammed II., placed the brother of Vlad, Radul the Fair, on the throne in the autumn of 1462, on condition of his paying a yearly tribute of 12,000 ducats; he also recognised the supremacy of the Hungarian king Matthias, who kept the hypocritical Vlad and Peter Aaron V., the Voivode of Moldavia, who had also been expelled, prisoners in Ofen. Radu was for the second time definitely driven out in the autumn of 1473 by his Moldavian neighbour, Stefan the Great; in the period of confusion which followed he soon lost his life.

His successor, Laiot, known as Basarab the Elder, lost the favour of Stefan in 1474 on account of his undue partiality for the Turks; he, too, was driven out by Moldavian and Transylvanian troops on October 20th, 1474. He again suffered this fate at the end of 1476. Vlad, the "impaler," once again took his place upon the throne of the voivodes with the help of Hungary. However, his death soon followed, and a family war continued

for two years between the Basarabs; the younger Basarab, the "little impaler," maintained himself with increasing power from 1477 to 1481. An unfrocked monk

then became master of Hungarian Wallachia under the title of Vlad V. (1481-1496); he was a submissive vassal of the Porte, showing none of the desire for freedom manifested by Stefan the Great. A convention of 1482 established the river Milkov as the frontier between the two principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia.

The son and successor of Vlad, Radul IV. or V. (1496-1508), who, in many respects, is rightly styled the "Great," attempted to relieve the general distress by reforms in the administrative and ecclesiastical systems, espe-

cially directed against the encroachments of Nifon, the patriarch of Constantinople. Although he did personal homage in Constantinople in 1504, the Turks deprived him of the Danube customs receipts in 1507. Michael, or Mihnea,

A Period of Brief Reigns and Lawlessness

who was supposed to be the son of Vlad, the "impaler," reigned for two years (1508 to 1510), until he was forced to abdicate by party struggles. The leader of the opposition party, Vladut, or Vladice (Little Vlad, 1510-1512), recognised the supremacy of Hungary, was defeated by the dissatisfied Boyars who were in alliance with Mohammed of Nicopolis, and was beheaded on January 25th, 1512.

Basarab III. Neagoe (1512-1521), who was descended on his mother's side from a Boyar family of Olten, now occupied the throne of the voivodes; he was a peace-loving ruler, and gave his generous support to churches and monasteries; he dedicated, in 1517, the beautiful church of Curtea-de Arges, which was restored in 1886 under King Carol. His successors were from 1525 to 1530 mere tools in the hands of the Turks, were generally at war with one another, and usually fell by the hand of an assassin. The consciousness of national existence seemed to have wholly disappeared from the people; the nobles spoke Slavonic and also Greek, and attempted to enrich themselves in conjunction with the Turkish grandees.



VLAD THE IMPALER

A bloodthirsty ruler of Wallachia, whose lust of plunder gave Turkey good excuse for joining with Moldavia, in 1462, and dethroning him.

A Bloodthirsty Ruler of Wallachia

in 1474 on account of his undue partiality for the Turks; he, too, was driven out by Moldavian and Transylvanian troops on October 20th, 1474. He again suffered this fate at the end of 1476. Vlad, the "impaler," once again took his place upon the throne of the voivodes with the help of Hungary. However, his death soon followed, and a family war continued

Towards the end of the sixteenth century the throne of the voivodes was secured by Michael II. the Bold (1593-1601), a brilliant soldier and a dexterous politician. Between 1599 and 1601 he also occupied Transylvania and Moldavia. He was a

**Successful
Merchant
Becomes King**

son of the Voivode Petrascu (1554-1557), and in his youth had carried on an extensive commercial business.

Through his wife Stanca he was related to the most powerful families, in which he found strong support against the preceding Voivode Alexander Mircea; after an unsuccessful attempt at revolt he eventually secured the throne in September, 1593, chiefly with the help of Andronicus Cantacuzenos. On November 5th, 1594, Michael concluded an alliance with Sigismund Bathori and Aaron of Moldavia, and shortly afterwards, on November 13th, massacred the Turks in Jassy and Bucharest. He then defeated several Turkish and Tartar armies in a brilliant winter campaign, and won a great victory at Kalugareni on August 23rd, 1595. The glorious deeds of this brave Wallachian resounded throughout Christian Europe during his lifetime. In 1598, he formed an alliance with the Emperor Rudolf II. against the Prince of Transylvania, who abdicated in the spring of 1599. However, when Cardinal Andreas ascended the throne, Michael, vigorously supported by the adventure-loving Cossacks of the Dnieper, invaded the country on October 17th, 1599, secured the help of the Szeklers, besieged Hermannstadt, and won a victory on October 28th on the heights of Schellenberg. Andreas Bathori was murdered while fleeing to the country of the Szeklers.

Michael advanced in triumph to Weissenburg, and was appointed imperial governor on November 20th; on May 7th, 1600, he crossed the frontiers of Moldavia. The Voivode Jeremias Mogila fled to Poland. The bold ruler seemed to have conceived the idea of securing the throne of that country for himself; even at the present day he is known by the Wallachians as King Michael—also Alexander—the Great. He made preparations

for an invasion of Poland, but he was forced to return to Weissenburg in order to negotiate with Pezzen, the ambassador of the Hungarian king, about Transylvania; on July 1st he caused himself to be proclaimed Prince of Wallachia and Moldavia and also of Transylvania in the name of Hapsburg.

Dangers, however, threatened him from another side. The Poles and the Turks were menacing his frontiers, and Sigismund Bathori was meditating an invasion of Moldavia. Transylvania itself was so entirely impoverished in consequence of Michael's continual military enterprises, that the nobles broke into open revolt against him and refused to perform military service. After a disastrous battle at Mirislav on September 18th, 1600, Michael fled, and was again defeated in his own country by the Pole Jan Zamojski, between Buzau and Plojesti; he could not even make head against Simeon Movila, who defeated him at Arges. Meanwhile the

Transylvanian nobles chose the characterless Sigismund Bathori as their ruler for the third time, on February 3rd, 1601. Michael had betaken himself to Prague on December 25th, 1600, and had there presented to the court a memorial in his own justification; he obtained 80,000 florins, and with his troops joined the army of the Austrian general, George

Basta, in Transylvania. On August 6th, 1601, the Prince of Transylvania was defeated in the battle of Goroslau; he fled to Moldavia, where he received a letter in which Michael undertook to help him to the throne if he would hand over his wife and children, who had been left as hostages in Transylvania after his fall. This piece of treachery was reported to Basta, who had Michael murdered on August 19th, 1601, in Thorda, probably in fulfilment of instructions previously received.

After Michael the Bold the position of voivode was occupied by wholly unimportant personalities. The only important ruler was Matthias Basarab (1632 to April, 1654). He defeated the Ottoman claimant Radu, the son of the Moldavian Voivode



MICHAEL THE BOLD

The glorious exploits against the Turks of this Roumanian prince, who ruled Wallachia from 1593 to 1601, aroused great enthusiasm throughout the Christian world at the time of their performance.



THE NATIONAL STATUE TO MICHAEL THE BOLD AT BUCHAREST

Alexander Ilias, at Bucharest. He carefully protected his boundaries against the encroachments of the Danube Turks, and took particular trouble to secure the general increase and advancement of national prosperity, while suppressing Greek influence, which had become predominant. In 1652 he founded the first printing-press, organised schools and monasteries, secured the composition of a legal code on the model of Slav and Greek compilations of the kind, and translated ecclesiastical books into Wallachian. No doubt his efforts in these directions were stimulated by the examples of the Transylvanian prince, Gabriel Bethlen of Itkar (1630-1639) and George I. Rakoczy (1631-1648), who set up Wallachian printing-presses in 1640, and published many ecclesiastical books in Wallachian.

His object was to spread the Reformation among the Wallachians; for since the catechisms of Hermannstadt in 1544 and the Old Testament of 1582, this movement had found adherents among the Roumanians of South-east Hungary. As a matter of fact his efforts led to no more permanent result than

those of John Honterus, the reformer of the Saxons of Transylvania. Neither the doctrine of Luther nor that of Calvin gained any lasting hold on the hearts of the Wallachians, but these publications gave a considerable impulse to the Roumanian written language and to intellectual life in general.

The proceedings of Matthias Basarat were successfully imitated by his contemporaries and opponents and by the Voivode of Moldavia, Basile Lupu, and one of his successors, Serban II. Cantacuzenos (1679 to November 8th, 1688). The Moldavian Logoset Eustratios had already translated the Byzantine legal code into Moldavian in 1643; in 1688 the Bible in Roumanian was printed by two laymen, the brothers Greceanu.

Side by side with these ecclesiastical works, which consisted chiefly of translations from Greek and Slav, chronicles arose by degrees, such as those of Michael of Miron and Nicolae Costin, of Grigore Ureche the "Romanist," and of Danovic, Neculcea and Axente. Under the influence of ecclesiastical literature religious lyric poetry also flourished; the chief

representatives of this were the metropolitan Dositheos of Jerusalem, Michael Halitiu, the high Logosat Miron Costin who was executed by Kantemir the Old, and Theodore Corbea. However, the chief glory of Roumanian scholarship in that period is Dimitrie Kantemir (1673-1723), philosopher, poet, geographer, historian, and an intermediary between Eastern and Western science and literature.

Hard times soon put an end to these promising impulses, which spread even more vigorously to Moldavia in 1680. Under the rich Voivode Constantine Brankovan (1688-1714), who was in other respects a good ruler, disasters burst upon the country, which was transformed into a military road during the wars of Austria, Poland, and Russia with the Turks. Brankovan entered upon an alliance in 1698 and 1711 with the Tsar Peter the Great. Shortly before Easter, 1714, Brankovan was imprisoned in Bucharest, and executed in Constantinople with his four sons and his adviser. The same fate befell his successor, Stefan III. Cantacuzenos (1714 to June, 1716).

This event extinguished the last glimmer of Wallachian independence; the freely elected voivode ceased to exist, and

voivodes appointed by the Porte ruled henceforward, who brought Wallachia to the point of collapse as they had brought Moldavia, and initiated a period of total decline from an economic point of view; the tribute at that date amounted to more than 140,000 dollars a year. The first of these foreigners, who were generally rich Greeks, was Nikolaus Mavrocordato, who had previously been prince of Moldavia on two occasions (1716-1730). The accession of this first Greek prince, who himself came from the Island of Chios and not from Phanar, forms an important epoch in the literature of Daco-Roumania, the first age of which, beginning about 1550, here comes to an end.

In the course of the eighteenth century, Russia began to interfere in the domestic affairs of the country, a process which culminated in the occupation of Wallachia by the Russians during the Russo-Turkish war of 1770. By the peace of Kutchuk-Kainardji, in 1774, Wallachia again fell under Turkish supremacy; but Russian influence kept the upper hand, and in 1781 the Porte agreed to set up a Hospodar government under the supervision of the Russian general Consul.



MATTHIAS BASARAB

After Michael the Bold, he was the only Wallachian ruler of note in the history of the nation. He reigned from 1632 to 1654, and did much for his country, founding the first printing-press in 1652.



SERVIAN REJOICING AT THE NEWS OF THE MURDER OF SULTAN MURAD



THE MOLDAVIAN PEOPLE AND THEIR STRUGGLE FOR NATIONALITY

BOUNDED on the west by the Carpathians, on the north and east by the Pruth and Russia, on the south-east by the Danube and the Dobrudza, and on the south by the Sereth, the mountainous country of Moldavia, the second division of Roumania, is especially suited for agriculture and cattle-rearing. The Roumanians and their Slavonic teachers seem to have fled to the rivers on the occupation of the country. The name appears in historical times towards the middle of the fourteenth century.

As early as 1335 Bogdan, the son of Micul, had caused the despatch of a Hungarian primate to the country, on account of his disobedience to King Charles Robert I. In 1342, when the Angevin ruler was dead, and his son, Lewis, had succeeded to the throne at the age of sixteen, Bogdan again revolted. Although the youthful king declined to acknowledge his position as voivode, the rebel was supported by the Lithuanians of the Halitskland and by the Roumanian mountaineers, and was able to maintain his position in the Marmaros; in 1352 his submission caused but little change in his position. At that time this south-east corner of Europe was in a constant state of disturbance; and on the first occasion of peace Bogdan followed the example of Basarab and shook off the Hungarian yoke in 1360, to which success he was aided by the "benevolent neutrality" of Poland. About 1365 Bogdan was the undisturbed master of Moldavia.

After his death his eldest son, Latzko, ruled the country, practically in the position of a Polish vassal; in 1370 he permitted the erection of a Catholic bishopric at Sereth. After this a series of events followed which are partly shrouded in obscurity, but none the less point to a Lithuanian Ruthenian foundation for the young state. As late as the fifteenth century the language of Little Russia predominated as a means of communication.

However, Moldavia definitely shut the door in the face of Slav influence at a comparatively early period, an attitude adopted at the present time by Roumania.

Partly explained by the influence of geographical position, this fact is also due to a number of occurrences, which at that

Ruthenian Advance Eastwards time gave Moldavia a separate position apart from the three Balkan states similar to that occupied by the modern

kingdom of Roumania. There is no doubt that a considerable number of Lithuanians and Ruthenians removed to the Sereth from the district of Marmaros, together with the conqueror Bogdan. Even in the official documents of Stefan the Great, in the second half of the fifteenth century, a large number of Ruthenian names are to be observed; there, as they advanced eastward, they met with a number of settlers from Little Russia, upon whom the Wallachians looked askance as strangers. After the death of Latzko, in 1374, the Lithuanian Knez or supreme judge, George Koriatic, was brought into the principality of Baia; he, however, soon disappeared, and was probably poisoned. Equally short was the reign of a certain usurper known as Stefan I. His son Peter (probably 1379-1388) took the oath of fidelity to the Polish king Vladislav II. Jagiello in Lemberg in 1387; he conquered Suczava, which he made his capital. His youngest brother, Roman, who immediately succeeded him—he had been co-regent from 1386 at latest—was carried off to Poland in 1393 by the orders of Vladislav, and replaced by his elder brother, Stefan III.

Polish Supremacy in Moldavia He was made a tributary vassal by the Hungarian king Siegmund at the end of 1394, but on January 6th, 1395, he again solemnly recognised the Polish supremacy. In the year 1400 Juga, the illegitimate son of Roman, enjoyed a short period as governor at Suczava.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century the first important voivode of Moldavia

began his government; this was Alexander, the other son of Roman, who was known as the "Good" even during his lifetime. During his long reign (1401-1432) he reorganised the defences, the administration, and the military system, compiled a legal code from the "Basilika" of Leo VI., and improved the intellectual

Marks of Intellectual Progress

state of the people by founding schools and monasteries. Upon three occasions he took the oath of fidelity to the King of Poland in 1402, 1404, and 1407, on the last occasion as the first "lord" of the Moldavian territory. He married, as his third wife, Rynghalla, the sister of King Vladislav, after sending auxiliary troops to Marienburg to the help of the Poles against the German Orders. During his reign numerous settlers from Lesser Armenia migrated into the country, most of whom afterwards removed to Transylvania; at this period, also, the first gipsies appeared in the country.

Under his sons Elias and Stefan V., the supremacy of Poland was again recognised in 1433. The two step-brothers began a severe struggle for the supremacy, which ended in a division by which Stefan obtained the south, while Elias secured the north of Moldavia with Suczava. In 1442 Stefan concluded an alliance with the Hungarian general Hunyadi to oppose the Turkish danger, and in the following May, 1443, he caused his step-brother to be blinded. However, Roman II., a son of Elias, put an end to his uncle's life in the middle of July, 1447, and secured the position of voivode for himself. But in the next year, 1448, Peter IV., a son of Alexander the Good, who had fled to Hungary to Hunyadi, and had married his sister, returned to his native land with a Hungarian army and drove out Roman, who fled to Podolia to ask help from the Polish king. Roman died of poison on July 2nd, 1448. Peter

Plots and Counterplots in Moldavia

now took the oath of fidelity to King Kasimir IV., and continued to rule under Hungarian and Polish supremacy until the year 1449. Then Bogdan II., an illegitimate son of Alexander the Good, revolted on February 11th, and on July 5th, 1450, concluded two important treaties with Hunyadi, but was murdered in 1451 by the Voivode Peter V., formerly Aaron, an illegitimate son of Alexander the Good. Peter was then forced to divide the

government of Moldavia with Alexander "Olechno," a son of Elias, who had been originally supported by Poland and afterwards by Hungary; but in 1455 Alexander was poisoned by his own Boyars. Peter now ruled alone until 1457, and was able to maintain his power only by a miserable and cowardly subjection to Poland and the Turks. From 1455 the Porte was able to consider the Voivode of Moldavia, with his tribute of 2,000 Hungarian florins, as one of its permanent vassals.

After this almost uninterrupted period of party struggles for the dignity of voivode, a period of unspeakable misery for the country, an age of rest and prosperity at last dawned in the second half of the fifteenth century; henceforward Moldavia, which had hitherto been placed in the background under the title of Wallachia Minor, or Bogdania, became of more importance than the older "Roumanian" district, which had been brought low by the two Vlads, the Devil and the Impaler. The Voivode Stefan VI. (1457 to July 2nd, 1504), a son of Bogdan II., was rightly surnamed the "Great" by his people.

Moldavia Rises in Power and Importance

The miniature painting in the book of Gospels of Voronetz, which remains comparatively undamaged, has preserved a not unpleasing portrait of this ruler. A brilliant general and politician, he not only extended his realm, but also removed it from the political influence of his two neighbouring states. He advanced the established church, which was dependent on the orthodox patriarch at Achrida, and the good order of which was in strong contrast to the confusion prevailing at Wallachia, founded a third bishopric at Radautz, where he also restored the old monastery church, and also built a great monastery at Putna in Bukovina.

He incorporated a Bessarabian frontier district of Wallachia with his own country, recovered Chilia in January, 1465, and in December, 1467, successfully repelled an attack of the Hungarian King Matthias, who was wounded by an arrow at Moldovabanya in the course of this campaign. Harassed by Tartar invasions, Stefan nevertheless found leisure to invade Transylvania during the Bohemian expedition of King Matthias in 1469, and to expel Radu, the Voivode of Wallachia, in 1471-1473. The Hungarian king was occupied in the west until 1475, and overlooked this

MOLDAVIA'S STRUGGLE FOR NATIONALITY

aggression, more particularly as Stefan, in alliance with the Transylvanian Szeklers of Udvarhely and Esik, had driven back a Turkish army of 120,000 men—which invaded Moldavia under Suleiman Pasha on January 10th, 1475—at Racova, and had by this means diverted the danger from Hungary. The exploit is characteristic of this glorious age in which Moldavia often formed a bulwark against the Ottomans on the south and against the assaults of neighbours on the north.

The Sultan Mohammed II. now undertook in person a punitive campaign against Moldavia, and won a victory on July 26th, 1476, in the White Valley. Stefan, however, with the help of Stefan Bathori, who was accompanied by the fugitive Vlad the Impaler, eventually drove out the hostile army and secured for Vlad the position of voivode of Wallachia. However, after the death of Vlad at the end of 1476, the new voivode of Wallachia, Basarab, the Little Impaler, made an alliance with the Turks; Stefan overthrew him on July 8th, 1481, and handed over the position of voivode to a certain Mircea. With the object of securing their connection with the Tartars in the Volga districts, the Turkish armies of Bajazet II. invaded Moldavia again in 1484, together with Tartar and Wallachian allies, and stormed Chilia and Cetatea-Albam on July 14th and August 4th.

Only by means of Polish help, which he was forced to purchase by paying a homage long refused, was Stefan able to save his country from overthrow by the enemies' bands in 1485. Turning to his own advantage the necessities of Poland, which became pressing immediately afterwards, Stefan occupied Pokutia in 1490, and even paid tribute to the Porte to secure his position, as formerly Peter Aaron had done. In 1497 the Polish King, John Albert, invaded Bukovina with the intention of incorporating the whole principality with his own empire, and besieged Suczava, the capital until 1550; by the intervention of the Voivode of Transylvania an armistice was secured, and the end of the affair was that the Polish cavalry were surprised in the forests and scattered at Cozmin on the day of St. Demeter.

In 1498, Stefan appeared in person before Lemberg, and some one hundred thousand human beings were carried into captivity in Turkey. However, on the 12th or

18th of July, 1499, Stefan dissolved his connection with the Porte and concluded a convention with Poland and Hungary, wherein he tacitly recognised the supremacy of both states over Moldavia, and undertook to oppose the progress of the Turkish armies through his country and to keep the neighbouring states informed of

any hostile movements on the part of the Turks. Stefan fulfilled his obligations in 1499, when he put an end to the devastations of Balibeg, a son of Malkoch. After the death of John Albert he dissolved his connection with Poland and stirred up the Tartars against the new king, Alexander; while they devastated Podolia he occupied the Ruthenian Pokutia, and sent his Boyars and tax-gatherers to Sniatyn, Kolomea, and Halicz in 1502. This was the last success of this greatest of all Roumanians.

Stefan's son and successor, Bogdan III., known as Orbul, the "blind," the "one-eyed," or the "squint-eyed" (1504-1517), gave up his claim to Polish Pokutia in return for a promise of the hand of Elizabeth, a sister of Alexander; but he was cheated of this prize. The approach of the Turkish power induced him in 1504 to promise a yearly tribute to the sultan, consisting of 4,000 Turkish ducats, forty royal falcons, and forty Moldavian horses, in return for which, according to later reports, he was guaranteed the maintenance of Christianity; the voivodes were to be freely elected, and the country was to be self-governing in domestic affairs. This convention, which in recent times has formed the basis for the constitutional relationship of Moldavia with the Porte, was renewed by Peter Rares "the Restless" (1527-1528, and for the second time from the end of February, 1541, to September, 1546) in the year 1529; according to a document of 1532, he sent annually 120,000 aspers or 10,000 gold ducats to Constantinople. At a later period this tribute was considerably increased. With Peter Rares began the rule of the illegitimate branch of the house of Dragos, who was a natural son of Stefan the Great. The chief object of Peter after the disastrous defeat of Mohacs on August 29th, 1526, the significance of which he never understood, was to turn to his own advantage the disputes about the succession in Hungary, which had broken out

between King Ferdinand and John Zapolya; on several occasions he invaded Transylvania, inflicting appalling devastation on the country, which, in 1529, declined to accept his rule. An attempt to recover Pokutia from Poland was brought to an end by the defeat of Peter at Obertyn on August 22nd, 1531. His

Ottoman Oppression in Moldavia faithlessness brought about the fall of Aloisio Gritti, who had been sent by the sultan to Transylvania in 1533. After the expulsion of Peter in 1538, the voivodes of Moldavia became ready tools in the hands of the Porte; provided they paid the sultan a yearly tribute, they were allowed to govern their own territory precisely as they pleased. The people groaned under the burden of heavy taxation and extortion of every kind, and attempted to secure relief by joining the party struggles set on foot by individual wealthy families, hoping also to secure some momentary relief by the murder of their masters. Thus the Voivode Stefan VIII., "the Turk," or "the Locust"—so named after a plague of locusts in the year 1538—was murdered, in 1540, after a reign of two years. His successor, Alexander III., a scion of the legitimate Dragos family from Poland, met with the same fate in the same year. The Voivode Elias II. (1546-1551), a son of Peter Rares, was ordered by the sultan to invade Transylvania in 1550, but transferred this commission to his brother Stefan, abdicated in May, 1551, and soon afterwards died as the renegade "Mohammed," governor of Silistria. His place was occupied by his brother Stefan IX., the last direct descendant of the illegitimate branch of the Dragosids, until he was murdered by the Boyars in 1553.

His opponent and successor, Peter the Stolnic, known as Alexander IV. Lapusan (1553-1561), speedily made himself highly unpopular with the Boyars by his infliction of torture and death, from the stain of which he tried to cleanse his conscience by founding a monastery at Slatina. In 1561 the Greek sailor Jakobos Basilikos seized the position of voivode, under the title of John I.; he founded a Latin school at Cotnari (East Moldavia) and a bishopric, which was naturally but short-lived. After playing the part of a tyrant for two years he was murdered in the course of a popular rising on November 5th, 1563.

During and following upon the short rule of one Stefan X. Tomsa—beheaded in Poland in 1564—Alexander IV., who had fled to Constantinople, resumed the government (1563-1568), until he gradually went blind. His son Bogdan IV. (1568-1572) was wounded by an angry nobleman while visiting his betrothed in Poland.

The sultan then appointed as Voivode of Moldavia John II., a Pole of Masovia, who had accepted the Mohammedan faith in Constantinople, where he was believed to be a descendant of Stefan IX., who had been killed in 1553. In order to secure his independence, John allied himself with Cossacks—hence his name of "rebel"—but was surrounded in Roscani, and executed on June 11th, 1574. The Cossacks, who were forced to organise under Stefan Bathori in 1576, were at that period a bold robber-tribe, feared both by the Tartar and the Ottoman; they devastated the districts on the far side of the Dniester from their islands in that river, and after 1595 sought to find opportunity for their wild military exploits, under Michael the Bold, even in Wallachia itself. At the same time, like

The Sultan as Dictator the ancient Vikings, they put a stop to all trade on the Black Sea for forty years. Peter VII. the "Lame," the son of Mircea of Wallachia, who was appointed voivode by the sultan (1574-1577), held from the first a precarious position, and was overthrown after surviving an attack from the Cossack protégé, John the "Curly"; his conqueror, the Cossack, John or Peter Potkova, "the breaker of horseshoes," in this respect a predecessor of Augustus the "Strong," reigned for a few days, and was then executed in Lemberg by the order of the Polish king Stefan Bathori (1575-1586). The sultan then, in 1577, again conferred the position of voivode on Peter VII., whom he expelled in the following year, until he restored him afterwards for the third time (1584-1592).

Moldavia was at that time a plaything in the hands of the Ottomans, who expelled and appointed voivodes as they pleased, while their deputies and their troops devastated the country in all directions. Before Peter became voivode for the third time the country had been governed, for a short period in 1578, by Alexander, a brother of Potkova, and, after a constant succession of real and

MOLDAVIA'S STRUGGLE FOR NATIONALITY

pretended claimants, by a certain Jankul the "Saxon" of Transylvania, who had used the wealth of his wife, a Palæologa of Cyprus, to induce the authorities of Constantinople to depose Peter and to confer the position of voivode of Moldavia upon himself in 1579. He became involved in a quarrel with Stefan Bathori, through his encroachments upon the Polish frontier, and was taken prisoner and beheaded in 1582. One of his successors, Aaron, who had formerly been a coachman and then a Boyar, was driven out by the Cossacks in 1591, after a reign of one year, and fled to Constantinople.

The Cossacks restored Peter in 1592; but he was captured by the Transylvanian troops of Sigismund Bathori and handed over to the sultan, who executed him. Aaron was now placed for the second time in the position of voivode (1592-1595), and pursued a foreign policy of unblushing duplicity; on November 5th, 1594, he made an alliance at Bucharest with Sigismund Bathori and with Michael of Wallachia against the Turks; however, he deserted the Wallachians, was taken as a prisoner to Alvincz by the Transylvanian troops, and died there in 1597. His successor Stefan XI. Resvan supported Sigismund Bathori in his enterprises against the Turks, but was impaled at the end of 1595 by the Polish chancellor Jan Zamoiski, who had invaded Moldavia.

In August the position of voivode was taken over by Jeremias Mogila, or Movila (1595-1608), a feeble character, who allowed the country to fall entirely under Polish supremacy. At that time Southern Moldavia had been driven to find room for 15,000 Tartar settlers; the tribute which the Khan of the Crim Tartars, who from 1475 had harassed the Russians, Poles, and Roumanians, then subject to the Ottomans, had been receiving from Moldavia since 1566, "according to ancient custom," as the price for his consideration of their frontiers, was now dropped. However, this remarkable branch of the conquering Nogais, under the "Mirzak" Kantemir, lost their independence in 1637, though their marauding raids were still

continued. It was not until the seventeenth century that a better period began to dawn; after a conspiracy of the Boyars against Alexander VII. Elias, who favoured the Greeks, and after various other confusions the Greek Albanian Vasile Lupu came to the throne (1634-1653); he founded schools and benevolent institutions, and

did his best to improve the condition of the country. He was a cunning politician, and began intrigues against George Rakoczy, the ruler of Transylvania, which ended, in 1654, by his being captured himself by the Khan of Tartary, who sent him to Constantinople.

On January 8th, 1654, the Cossacks surrendered to the Russians. Moldavia, however, came under Transylvanian supremacy. The voivode Stefan XIII. (1653-

1658), after secret negotiations with the Russian Tsar (1654-1656), joined the Wallachian Constantine Basarab in placing himself under the protectorate of George Rakoczy II. As he supported this ruler in an attempt to secure the crown of Poland in 1675, the sultan declared him deposed.

The following years were a period of unspeakable misery and sorrow; the last two native rulers, Stefan XIV. and XV., maintained their position with interruptions until 1680 or 1690, but between 1658 and 1712 the Turkish court, at its will and pleasure, appointed rulers from the principal Albanian or Greek families.

A new period in the history of Moldavia (1712-1822) begins with the appointment of the Phanariot class to the position of voivode; they were merchants from Constantinople, and each one of them, intent solely upon his own enrichment, did his best to reduce the country to ruin.

The Russians occupied the country between 1769 and 1774, and then conferred the dignity of voivode upon Gregor III. Ghika, who was murdered by the Janissaries at Jassy in 1777.

After the death of Ghika the partition of Moldavia began. But of that process we have here to record only the beginning, when, in 1777, the province of Bukovina was incorporated in the Austrian dominions.

HEINRICH VON WLISLOCKI



VASILE "THE WOLF"

A ruler of Moldavia, able and cunning, but being captured by the Khan of Tartary he was delivered to the Turks in 1654.

**The Dawn
of
Better Days**



ALBANIANS: A SCATTERED RACE

THEIR WARS AND THEIR RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

THE country known to us as Albania is a district about 400 miles in length and 120 in breadth upon the average, which lies on the coast of the Balkan peninsula. Of this district, the Albanians proper, a strongly-marked nationality, occupy the north; the south-east is pure Greek; while the south-west contains both races, so intermingled that the children learn both languages simultaneously. Roumanians

Decadence of Albanian Independence

inhabit the district of Pindos, and Bulgarians and Serbs the district which borders their frontiers; on the other hand, the Albanian race has also extended far beyond the frontiers of Albania. On the Shah Dagħ Albanians have appropriated the whole western portion of Turkish Servia, extending to Bosnia, and inhabit the mountain region lying west and south-west of Novi Bazar. Large numbers of Albanians also dwell within the kingdom of Greece; in fact, the whole of Attica, with the exception of Athens and the Piræus, Megara, with the exception of the city, Bœotia, and the islands of Hydra and Spezzia, together with many other districts, are inhabited by them.

However, during the course of the nineteenth century the Albanian nationality in these parts has apparently suffered a considerable decrease, owing to the fact that many Albanian families have adopted Greek manners and the Greek language, as Greek is considered the more distinguished nationality. About 80,000 Albanians are settled in Italy, divided among the former provinces of Nearer and Further Calabria, Basilicata, Capitanata, Terra d'Otranto, Abruzzo Ulteriore and Sicily. The first mentioned were brought over about 1460 by Ferdinand I. to Naples. Their number was originally considerably greater, but many of them have been entirely Italianised in language, dress, and manners. Finally, three small Albanian colonies exist upon Austrian soil—one on the Save, between Shabatz and Mitrovitza, one at

Zara, and one at Pola. The Albanians are divided into two main branches, which are also distinguished from one another by language—the Toskans and the Geges. The former inhabited the south, the latter the central and northern parts of the country. Their respective dialects are so different that they have the utmost difficulty in understanding one another, and members of one branch are obliged by degrees to learn the dialect of the other. In other respects, too, a strange divergence between the two branches has existed from early times. An attempt has been made to explain the difference of dialect on the supposition that the inhabitants of the north were the Illyrians of antiquity, and those of the south the Epirots. This hypothesis is scarcely defensible. It is more probable that both branches are Thracian, and that of the two dialects, Gegish is the Thracian language as spoken by Illyrians, and Toskish is that language as spoken by Greeks; in other words, that the difference corresponds to that between Lombard and Tuscan Italian—namely, Latin in the mouth of Gauls and Latin in the mouth of Etruscans.

In respect of religion the land is again by no means uniform. The north is predominantly Roman Catholic, while in the south Greek Catholicism holds the upper hand. Mohammedanism, moreover, has spread throughout almost the whole country, and the number of its devotees is nearly equal to that of the Christians. The distinguished families, especially in the towns, are Mohammedans; there are, moreover, isolated country districts which are Mohammedan. It will be understood that all of these were at one time Christians, and that they have gone over to Mohammedanism in consequence of the very various forms of pressure which the Turks were able to exert at different times, even within the present

The Cross Versus the Crescent

THE ALBANIANS: A SCATTERED RACE

century. The only tribe which has remained pure Catholic is that of the Miridites, in the north, from the fact that every apostate was immediately forced to leave the district. There are besides districts which are Mohammedan only in seeming, and acknowledge Christianity in secret, at the present day as previously.

Although, as we have said, the Albanians are thus divided by geographical, religious, and linguistic differences, yet they form one nationality with a strongly marked national character, arising primarily from the conception of the family, which has dominated the whole life of this people. It is by the solidarity of family life that we must explain their tenacious observation of ancient customs, which accompany every detail of household life, birth, engagement, marriage and death; thus, too, is explicable that fearful scourge of this nation, the blood feud, and also the political impotence of the country in spite of the great bravery of its inhabitants.

The strongly marked conservatism apparent in all these facts has also contributed to the maintenance of numerous survivals of the old heathen popular religion side by side with the different religions which individuals have adopted as their official belief. As survivals of this nature are the belief in the Elves, a household spirit, three monsters known as Kutshreda, Sükjennesa and Ljubia, the Ore, Mauthi, Fatiles, Dive, Fljamea Kukudi, Vurvulak—known among the Geges as Ljuvgat and Karkancholi—the Shtrigea, Dramgua, and the men with tails. There is no reason to suppose that these demoniacal beings are the survivals of some old pure Albanian popular belief; they probably represent, to some degree, remnants of early Greek, Roman, Slavonic, Turkish, and perhaps gipsy superstition. The origin of the component parts of this popular belief cannot be pointed to with certainty. When we examine the appellations of these separate beings, it might be supposed that they originated from the nation from whose language they took their names; but no reliance can be placed on this theory. The Albanian vocabulary for every department of life is a motley mixture taken from all possible languages, so that it is highly probable that in mythology foreign names might often represent

native conceptions. The Elves, known as the "Happy Ones," or as the "Brides of the Mountain," display a considerable resemblance to the fairies of German mythology, who bear the same name. They are generally feminine, about the size of twelve-year-old children, of great beauty, clothed in white, and of vaporous form. They come down in the night from the mountains to the homes of men, and invite beautiful children to dance; often, too, they take little children out of the cradles to play with them upon the roofs of the houses, but bring them back unharmed.

Similar is the character of the Mauthi, as she is called in Elbassan, who is probably to be identified with the Southern Albanian "Beauty of the Earth." She, too, is a fairy clothed in gold, with a fez adorned with precious stones; "the man who steals this is fortunate for the whole of his life." Goddesses of fate are the Ore and the Fatiles; the former goes about the country and immediately fulfils all the blessings and curses which she hears. The Fatiles are the same as the ancient Greek Moirai. The Attic Albanians have only one of these deities, who still bears the ancient name of Moira; however, all the gifts which are offered to her upon a birth in the house are tripled.

Horrible demons are the cannibal female monsters Kutshedra, Sükjennesa, and Ljubia. Connected with them is the Fljamea of Elbassan, also a female demon, who can afflict with epilepsy. The Dif, or the Dive in the plural, are giants of supernatural size, while the household spirit, the Vittore, is conceived as a brightly coloured snake, which lives in the wall of the house, and is greeted with respect and wishes of good fortune by any one of the inhabitants who catches sight of it. The Vurvulak, known in some places as vampires, are sufficiently explained by this second title. Of a similar nature are the Ljuvgats, "Turkish corpses with long nails, which go about in their grave clothes, devouring what they find, and strangling men," as also are the Karkantsholjes or Kukudes, the corpses of gipsies whose breath is poisonous.

The literary monuments of the people are very few; all that can be called literature is confined to translations of the Bible and similar ecclesiastical

compositions, to national songs, and a few attempts at poetry among the Italian Albanians, and in Albania itself. Among the former we may mention Girolamo de Rada (1870), who has treated of the heroic period of his nation—that is to say,

Albania's Most Famous Poet the wars of Skanderbeg. The poet of Albania most famous amongst his compatriots is Nezim Bey of Bremet. He

was a scholar acquainted with Arabic and Persian literature, and it was under the influence of these Oriental literatures that his poems were composed, as they indeed declare by their strong infusion of Arabic and Persian words. The spirit also is undeniably Oriental, and their similarity with the poems of Hafiz, for instance, is unmistakable. The national songs are not without a beauty which

is strikingly foreign to our ideas. Our information upon the actual history of the Albanians is for the most part very fragmentary. Native historical sources there are none; we are reduced to the references derived from the history of those nations with whom the Albanians were brought into connection. Hence our chief sources are the Byzantine chroniclers, "who trouble themselves very rarely about these remote provinces." Our earliest direct information belongs to the year 1042; at that date, after subjugating the Bulgarian revolt, Michael Paphlago, the

governor of Dyrrhachium, gathered an army of 60,000 men from his province and advanced with it against the Serbs. When the Normans made their expeditions of conquest (1081-1101), the rule of the despots of Epirus from the house of the Comneni began, and it lasted until 1318.

The land then fell again into the hands of the Byzantine emperors; but the restless population repeatedly rose in revolt, and the most cruel coercion failed to secure a definite pacification. In the year 1343 fresh disturbances broke out, of which the Servian king, Stefan Dusan, took advantage to conquer the whole of Albania, Thessalia and Macedonia, and assumed the corresponding title of emperor of these countries. Upon his death the Servian kingdom fell into confusion, and Nice-

phorus, son of the last despot, attempted to seize the government of Albania, but was defeated by the Albanians and killed in battle (1357-1358). The Albanians now fell again partly into the hands of the Servian despot Simon. As, however, he troubled himself but little about the country, the Albanians founded two practically independent provinces—a southern province under Gjinos Vayas, and a northern province under Peter Ljoshas.

Then began a period of Albanian migration, during which large portions of Macedonia, Thessalia, Ætolia and Acarnania were occupied by parties starting from Durazzo. Thence the Albanians spread further to Livadia, Bœotia, Attica, South Eubœa, and the Peloponnese. After the death of Peter Ljoshas, in 1374, John Spata seized the town of Arta. His rule

was a period of long struggles with different opponents, which continued almost until his death in 1400. About this time most of the country was conquered by Carlo I. Tocco, who died on July 4th, 1429, and bequeathed what he had won to his nephew Carlo II. Tocco of Cephallenia, who was obliged, however, to cede the town of Janina in 1439 to Murad II., and to acknowledge his supremacy.

The process of converting the country to Mohammedanism then began, and has continued till within the last century. It was chiefly the

upper classes that embraced Mohammedanism, and for this reason they were able to found native dynasties, which in some cases actually acquired hereditary rule. Of these native pashas of Janina the best known is Ali, who was born in 1741 at Tepeleni, and murdered on February 5th, 1822, in a summer-house on the lake of Janina, by Khurshid Pasha. North Albania, which had become a Servian province, has a history of

Venetian Help Against the Ottomans its own. About the year 1250 it went over to the Catholic Church, as appears from the letters of Pope Innocent IV. The family legend of the Miridite chieftain preserves the memory of this event. The disruption from Servia, in which the noble family of the Balzen took a prominent part, occurred about 1368, and therefore



FAMOUS CHRISTIAN HERO
George Kastrioti, known as "Skanderbeg," was the great Christian hero who waged war against the Turks for twenty years in Albania. He began his struggle in the year 1444.

THE ALBANIANS: A SCATTERED RACE

after the death of Stefan Dusan in 1355. With the year 1383 begin the invasions of the Ottomans, whom the Albanians opposed with Venetian help. Among these Turco-Albanian struggles those of Skanderbeg stand out prominently. Yban, or John George Kastrioti, was born after 1403, the son of Yban or John Kastrioti, the dynast of Mat, and of Voisava, the Servian princess of Polog. In 1423 he was carried off, with his three brothers, by the Emir Murad II. in the course of an incursion into Southern Albania, kept as a hostage for his father's fidelity, and employed in the royal Seraglio. There he was brought up in the Mohammedan faith, and given the name of Iskander or Alexander Bey, popularised as Skanderbeg. Conspicuous for his handsome form and intellectual powers, he very soon obtained a superior post in the administration. In 1442, upon the death of his father, Yban, the principality was occupied by the emir, and his brothers were killed. The revolts conducted by Arianites Comnenus, who died in 1461, Depas, or Thopia, and Zenempissa, were crushed by the Turks.

Kastrioti concealed his thirst for vengeance, and remained in the Turkish service as if nothing had occurred. When, however, at the close of 1443 the Hungarians defeated the Turks, George escaped, with 300 Albanians, from the Turkish camp, and seized Kruja by a trick. He re-adopted Christianity, inspired his compatriots to fight for their independence, and occupied the whole district in a month. All the chiefs placed themselves under his

command, and paid tribute for the maintenance of the revolt. Skanderbeg continued the war with vigour, and in 1444, with 15,000 men, he defeated the Turkish army, 40,000 strong under Ali Pasha, and other Ottoman generals in the district of Dibra. In the year 1449 he attacked Murad with 100,000 men, but was defeated and forced to withdraw from Kruja, which he besieged.

After the death of Murad II., in 1451, he remained victorious upon the whole, notwithstanding disunion among the chieftains and several defeats which he


suffered; in the ten years' armistice of May, 1461, Albania was formally ceded to him. He showed great organising ability, and made the country a stronghold of Christianity, and his vigorous services to this faith induced Pope Pius II. to select him as general for his proposed crusade in the year 1464. The result of this movement was a further outbreak of war, and once again the Turks were defeated. But on January 17th, 1468, Skanderbeg

died at Alessio. His son being still a minor, the Turks were victorious. It cost them, however, ten years' fighting before they reconquered Kruja, on June 15th, 1478, and succeeded in bringing the land under their sway in 1479. After that date large bodies emigrated from North Albania, and the majority of the Albanian colonies in Italy belong to that period. Another part of the conquered Albanians preferred to remain upon the spot and accept Mohammedanism, while the remainder fled into the mountains.



TYPES OF ALBANIAN MOUNTAINEERS

KARL PAULI



Temple of Diocletian's palace, now Spalatro Cathedral



Temple of Rome and Augustus at Pola



Courtyard of Diocletian's palace at Spalatro



REMAINS OF THE GREAT ROMAN AMPHITHEATRE AT POLA IN AUSTRIA

MEMORIALS OF THE ROMAN OCCUPATION OF SLAVONIA



THE SOUTHERN SLAV PEOPLES

MOVEMENTS OF A WIDESPREAD RACE AND THEIR ABSORPTION INTO OTHER NATIONS

AS the history of the German races emerges from obscurity only upon their contact with the Greeks and Romans on the Rhine, on the Danube, and in the Mediterranean territories, so also the early history of the Slav races has been preserved by the Græco-Roman civilisation, which by degrees drew all peoples from darkness to light, and stirred them to new life as though by a magician's wand. It was chiefly with the Romans that the Germans came into contact by reason of their geographical position; for similar reasons the Slavs fell within the area of Greek civilisation, though here again by the intervention of the Roman Empire. Slav history is thus connected with Roman history. At the point where Slavs were the immediate neighbours of the Romans their annals reach back to the beginning of our era, though it was not until some 500 years later that the northern Slav race appeared upon the scene. It was upon

The Slavs' First Contact With Rome

the Adriatic and in the river system of the Central and Lower Danube that the Slavs first came into contact with the Roman Empire; on the Adriatic and on the classical ground of the Balkan Peninsula, which was saturated with Græco-Roman civilisation, begins our earliest genuine knowledge of the Slavonic peoples.

The races which inhabited the districts on the Danube and southwards to the Peloponnesus are known in modern times as the Slovenians, Serbs, Croatians, and Bulgarians. They form collectively the South Slavonic group. As their origin is obscure, so also is their history confused; it is a history the threads of which are lost in many provinces belonging to different states, and bearing even at the present day different names; a history of tribes in which original divergences led in course of time to sharp distinctions of language, script, morals, religion and history, and which, even in political matters, are opposed as enemies.

Of their earliest history we know little enough. The Slavs were not so fortunate as the Germans, who found a historian in Tacitus as early as the first century. Modern inquirers agree upon the fact that the Slavs appeared in Europe ages ago, together with the other main European races, the Kelts, Greeks, Romans, and Germans, and that they

Slav Races Under Other Names

settled in Eastern Europe some where about the spot where they are still to be found as the earliest known inhabitants. The Slavs and their settlements are known to Pliny, Tacitus and Ptolemy. More extensive accounts are given of them by the Gothic historian Jordanes and the Byzantine Procopius, both in the sixth century.

From that time onwards information as to the Slav races becomes more copious. They bear different names. The Greek and Roman authors call them Veneti, while to the Germans they are known as Wends; another form is Antes. Procopius also informs us that the Antes were anciently known as Spores, which has been connected with the name Serb. The second name for the members of this race was Slavus—with variants—the name especially current among the Byzantines. Those tribes who settled in the old Roman provinces of Pannonia, Noricum, Rætia and Vindelicia were known collectively as Slavs or Slovenians. We hear of them in the sixth century as of some political importance, and as already waging war with the Bavarian race. It is

Bavarians at War with the Slavs

probable that some Slav kingdoms existed in the sixth century in the modern Hungary, Slavonia, Croatia, Carinthia, Styria, Carniola, Görz, Gradiska, and on the coast line.

From these Slav peoples settled on each side of the Central Danube, on the Drave and Save; many migrated southwards after the fifth and sixth centuries, and settled in the Balkan Peninsula. The

question arises whether they were the first Slav colonists in that district, or whether they found in the Balkan territories an older Slav population known under other names. On the solution of this question depends the problem of the Slav population of the Balkan Peninsula. Moreover, the Slavs from these districts

Byzantine Emperors in Alarm were not the only members of the race who went to the Balkan territories; we find traces of Slav immigrants from Eastern and Northern Europe. Formerly the opinion was general that the immigration of the Slavs into the Balkan territories took place during the period between the fifth and seventh centuries. It is now believed that certain traces of a much earlier migration have been discovered. Evidence for this fact is to be found in the older Slav place-names. This new theory can also be harmonised with the earliest historical evidence before us, and provides a natural explanation of the fact that the Slavs suddenly appeared in these territories in such numbers that even the Byzantine emperors found themselves obliged to take measures to prevent them from over-running Greece. The theory further explains why history has nothing to tell us of any great immigration or occupation of these countries by the Slavs in historical times; only now and again does history speak of the settlement of new bands of colonists by the emperors.

So long, however, as it is impossible to ascertain the nationality of many peoples living in those districts in the Roman period, such as Thracians, Skordiskans, Dacians, Illyrians, and others, so long will this problem remain unsolved. Hence we must first decide whether they are to be regarded as "immigrants" or as "indigenous"; only then can we discuss the question of earlier or later dates. It may be noted that the inhabitants of Bosnia

Inheritors of Roman Civilisation still display certain ethnological peculiarities which are ascribed to the Thracians and Dacians by Roman authors. Thus Pliny states that among the Dacians the men paint their bodies. Tattooing is at the present day customary among the Bosnian people. Other national characteristics also point to some relationship.

However this may be, our first knowledge of the Slavs, both in the Danube territories and in the Balkan Peninsula, is

gained from the Greeks and Romans when they established their empire in those directions. After the fall of the Roman Empire the Slavs inherited the Roman civilisation. The country was covered with towns, trading settlements, and fortresses. These territories were crossed by admirable military roads. In Thracia we find roads as early as the time of Nero, who built post-houses along them. All the emperors paid special attention to the Balkan Peninsula, as it was from there that they gained the most valuable recruits for their legions. No Roman emperor however, spread his glory so widely throughout the countries on each side of the Balkans as the conqueror of Dacia, the great Flavian, Trajan. His memory was and is still preserved among the Slavs, and his name was even added to the list of Slav deities. Bulgarian songs still sing the praises of the "Tsar Trojan." Many place-names still re-echo his name. We constantly find a Trajan's bridge, a Trajan's road, a Trajan's gate, or a Trajan's town. Trajan is also in general use as a proper name. All this is evidence

Goths and Huns in Search of Plunder for the fact that Trajan must have come into personal contact with the Slavs. As early as the fourth century the provinces of the peninsula were wealthy and densely populated, as we are informed by the contemporary writer Eunapios. A disastrous period began for these territories in the fourth and fifth centuries, when the Goths and Huns attacked and repeatedly devastated them in the course of plundering raids; possibly these assailants included some Slavonic bands. From this time onwards the Slavs on the far side of the Danube began to grow restless, especially in the old province of Dacia, and overflowed the whole of the Balkan Peninsula as far as the Peloponnese; the Slav language was spoken at Taygetos as late as the fifteenth century.

The Byzantine emperors themselves, in their brilliant capital on the Bosphorus, were threatened with attack. At that time the Byzantine emperors had more important cares and heavier tasks than the protection of the Balkan Peninsula from these barbarians, whom they were inclined to despise: their faces, from the moment of the foundation of Constantinople, were turned towards the east. Hence, in spite of repeated defeats, the Slavs were able steadily to advance. Things became even

worse after the death of the great Justinian. John of Ephesus, a Syrian chronicler of the sixth century, relates how "in the third year after the death of the Emperor Justinian and the accession of Tiberius the Victorious, the accursed people of the Slavs entered and overran the whole of Hellas in the neighbourhood of Thessalonica and the whole of Thracia. They conquered many towns and fortresses, ravaged, burned, and devastated the country, and lived in it as freely as at home."

In the year 575 the Avars, one of the peoples of the steppes formerly called in as auxiliaries by the Byzantines, began their invasions in the Byzantine Empire, and carried their plundering raids through the Balkan territories, alone or in alliance with the Slavs. The Slavs in Illyricum and the Alpine territories soon became restless. In Dalmatia, into which they had made incursions as early as the reign of Justinian, they began to advance with great energy about 600, and drove back the Roman power, which the Avars had already enfeebled, to the coast towns, to the mountains, and to the islands.

Slavs at the Siege of Constantinople

The Græco-Roman towns of the interior were for the most part laid waste, while such new towns as Spalatro and Ragusa were founded by the fugitive Romans.

The Slav immigrants soon also learnt the art of seamanship. During the siege of Constantinople in 626, which they undertook in alliance with the Avars, they conducted the attack from the seaward side in small boats. In the year 641 certain Slavs, probably from Epirus, landed on the Italian coasts and plundered Apulia. The Slav pirates traversed the Ionian and Ægean seas, penetrating even to the Cyclades and the coast towns of Asia Minor. Al-Achtal, an Arabian writer of the seventh century, speaks of the fair-haired Slavs as a people well-known to his readers. The enterprise of the Slavs was further facilitated by the fact that the Byzantine Empire was now in difficulties with the Arabs, as it had formerly been with the Persians. Their chief attack was directed about 609 against Thessalonica, the second city in the Byzantine Empire. They repeatedly besieged this town by land and water, and on one occasion were encamped for two years before its gates. The Byzantine authorities were, however, invariably successful in saving this outpost. In the seventh century the Slav

colonisation of the Balkan Peninsula was complete, and no corner remained untouched by them. The Byzantine authors of that period refer to the Balkan territories simply as Slavonia.

With regard to the influence which their change of domicile exercised upon the political development of the Slav immigrants and

Influence of Country on Slav Immigrants

the course of their civilisation, we are reduced to conjecture; generalisation is easier here than detailed proof, but in this case the connection between geographical position and history is unmistakable. The position of the Balkan Peninsula, which brought the southern Slavs nearer than any other members of the race to the Græco-Roman world, was of great importance for their future development. In the course of their historical career the southern Slav tribes wavered for a long time between Italy and Byzantium, until eventually the western portion became incorporated with Roman politics and civilisation, and the eastern portion with the Byzantine world.

For other facts, however, in the life of the southern Slavs, deeper causes must be sought, originating in the configuration of the country. If we regard the peninsula of Hæmus from the hydrographical and orographical point of view, we shall immediately perceive that the configuration of the country has determined the fate of its inhabitants. As the whole of the continent is divided from west to east by a watershed which directs the rivers partly to the Baltic and partly into the Danube, so also this south-eastern peninsula has its watershed which directs the streams partly towards the north and partly southwards. As the northern mountain range has divided the peoples, as well as the waters, which lie on each side of it, so, too, the same fact is apparent in the Balkans. The northern and the southern parts of the peninsula have run a different course of development with different results. The mountain range of the Balkans, rising to 12,146 feet, is difficult to cross, notwithstanding its thirteen passes; and many of the struggles between the northern and southern Balkan races were fought out on the ridges of these mountains. At the same time it must be said that other ethnographers have drawn different conclusions from these same orographical conditions.

Balkan Races and their Mountain Battles

Apart from these facts, the whole peninsula is divided by mountain ranges running in all directions into districts each of which with certain efforts might develop independently of others, as was the case in Western Europe. In ancient Hellas this was the fact which favoured the development of so many independent

Racial Characteristics Preserved territories, and during the Slav period it also facilitated the rise of several kingdoms.

In so far as it is unjust to regard the Balkan Peninsula as part of Eastern Europe, in the strict sense of the term, it is incorrect to call it an East European peninsula. Balkan territories are in every respect more allied to Western Europe, and are somewhat Alpine in character.

Thus the immigrant Slavs were easily able to continue their separate existence in this district, a fact which entirely corresponded with their wishes. Hence the manifold nature of the southern Slav kingdoms; for this reason, too, they were more easily accessible to influences which ran very diverse courses. Diversity of geographical configuration naturally produced diversity of civilisation; some districts lay on the main lines of communication, while others, more difficult of access because more mountainous in character, were left far behind in the march of progress. Differences of climate must also be taken into account.

Upon the whole, the magnificent position of the Balkan territories on the Mediterranean has at all periods favoured the development of the inhabitants. The fact that the Slavs here came into contact with the sea created new conditions of life and fresh needs. They learnt the art of seamanship, and rose to be a commercial nation. The southern Slavs show a different national type from the great mass of Slav nationality; their environment and their neighbours have given them a special national character. The

How did the Slavs Get Their Names? Slav races which settled in the Balkan Peninsula were numerous. Such different names

are known as Severane, Brsjakes or Berzetes, Smoljanes, Sagulates, Welesici, Dragovici, Milinci or Milenzes, Ezerites or Jeserzes, etc. In spite of numerous names applied to various Slav groups, we have practically no guide to tribal identity among them. These names are, however, of little importance for the determination of nationality. Apart from

the fact that they have often been transmitted to us in a corrupt form, their value is purely topographical and in no way ethnographical. They coincide with the names of the lakes, rivers, and mountains about which the tribes settled. The question then arises: did the tribes give their names to these mountains and rivers, or, what is more probable, did they themselves borrow the old names of these rivers, etc? The latter is the case with the names Timok = Timocane, Rorawa = Morawana, Narenta = Narentane, etc. The opinion of the Bulgarian scholar Marin St. Drinov appears to be correct, that at different times different tribes of the northern and western Slavs, or, rather, fragments of them, made settlements here; a further proof of the theory is the divergent dialects of the Bulgarian language.

Historians state that of the Slavs in the western half of the Balkans the Serbs and Croats were the most numerous, and that they alone founded kingdoms of their own side by side with the Bulgarian state. But this may mean no more

The Kingdoms of Serbia and Croatia than that, as in the case of Bohemia, Poland, or Russia, one small tribe was enabled, by the force of some favourable

circumstance, gradually to subdue other tribes, and to include them under its own name, while itself becoming denationalised by the conquered tribes. This may be true of the Serbs and Croats, as we have seen that it was of the Bulgarians. The whole group thus passed into one political unity, and then acquired some meaningless name, possibly taken from a river, mountain, lake, or town of the country, from a national leader, or perhaps from some totally different language. All, then, that can be said is this—that side by side with the Bulgarians in the east of the peninsula two important kingdoms, the Serbian and Croatian, were afterwards formed on the west; though each of these, like the Bulgarians, included several tribes.

The numerous Slav races, then, bore for the moment different names. Three of these, Bulgaria, Croatia, and Serbia, became important; and all others were included under these. The Greeks, however, gave them all collectively the one name of Slaveni, and knew the whole country as Slavonia. The Eastern Roman Empire was known as Romania by the

THE SOUTHERN SLAV PEOPLES

Slavs. This name, however, they applied particularly to the Thracian plain. At the present day the mountain tribes on the borders of the Thracian plain call the inhabitants of the plain Romanec and the women Romanka, although the whole country up to the neighbourhood of Constantinople was entirely under Slav influence.

The Slavs of that period, like most of the European peoples, were at a stage of civilisation which may be described as semi-nomadic. While cattle-rearing and hunting were their main sources of food, agriculture was also carried on, and, as among the Germans, was obligatory upon the women and slaves. An historian informs us that the Avars employed the Slav women for agricultural purposes and in place of draught-animals, which was no innovation on their part. Nomadic tribes periodically deserted the lands which they had ploughed, and removed to virgin soil.

Social and also civic life in the Balkan Peninsula, and probably among all the Slavs, is founded upon the family group or household (the *sadruga*), which has survived there, as in Lithuania and Russia, to the present day, so that it cannot be regarded as a consequence of a Byzantine or Turkish system of taxation. Survivals of household organisation have also been demonstrated to exist among the Germans of that particular period. The married children do not leave the father's house, but remain together under the government of the father or patriarch. All the members of such a family bear the name of the family chief; thus the descendants of Radovan and the people of the district they inhabited were known as Radovanici. When the family had so increased as to make common life impossible some portion broke away from the union, founded a new settlement, took a new name, and formed a new *sadruga*, which, however, remained in connection with the original family and worshipped the same deity, who thus remained a common object of reverence to several branch settlements. A *sadruga* might contain from fifty to sixty members; the chief was known as *starosta*, or *starjesina*, or *gospodar*, or *wladyka*, or *djedo*, or *domakin*.

The tribe originated in the union of several families. The family was administered by the elders, who apportioned the

work, performed the service of the gods during the heathen period, and represented the family in its external relations. Community of property made individual poverty impossible; those only who had been expelled from the federation of the family were abandoned. The affairs of the whole tribe were discussed by an

assembly of the elders. The district inhabited by a tribe was known as *Zupa*, and its central point, which also contained the shrine of the gods in the heathen period, was a citadel or *grad*. One of the elders or patriarchs was chosen as governor of a *Zupa*, and was then known as the *Zupan*, or, among the Croats, as the *Ban*.

To this social organisation, which continued longer among the Slavs than among the Germans, are to be ascribed all the defects and the excellencies of the Slav tribes. The families did not readily separate from each other, but soon increased to the size of tribes. Hence, cattle-breeding and agriculture were conducted to a considerable extent under a system of communal labour and reached a high pitch of prosperity; consequently they were able easily to colonise and permanently to maintain their hold of wide tracts of country. Other conquering nations, such as the Goths and Huns, poured over the country, leaving behind them only the traces of the devastation which they had caused, and then disappeared, whereas the Slavs settled in the country which they occupied.

A further consequence was that the Slavs were in no need of extraneous labour for agricultural purposes, and therefore slavery was never so firmly rooted an institution among them as among the Germans. The Slavs usually made their slaves members of the household, as is related by the Emperor Mauricius. The Slavs were also able to carry agriculture and manufacture to a higher point. Their standard of morality was higher, owing to their close corporate life and strong family discipline, a fact which also favoured the increase of their population. On the other hand, the Germans, among whom agriculture was performed by slaves, devoted themselves entirely to hunting and military pursuits.

Still this family organisation enables us to explain why the Slavs were not successful as the founders of states. Their

common family life, while implying reverence for their patriarch, also produced a democratic spirit which was entirely opposed to any strict form of constitution. No family was willing to become subject to another; all families desired to be equal; one defended the freedom of another. No family chief was willing to

Byzantine Historians on the Slav Character

acknowledge the supremacy of another, nor need we feel surprise that the blood feud was an institution which flourished upon such soil. Hence, among the Slavs it was far easier for an individual to secure the supremacy over a number of families or tribes if he stood outside them and was unshackled by their discipline.

It is, therefore, no mere chance that kingdoms of any importance could be founded among the Slavs only by foreign tribes, often invited for that purpose. This peculiarity of the Slav character struck the Byzantine historians. "They have abundance of cattle and corn, chiefly millet and rye," says the Emperor Mauricius; "rulers, however, they cannot bear," he says in another place, "and they live side by side in disunion. Independence they love above all things, and decline to undergo any form of subjection." Procopius also relates in the sixth century that the Slavs declined to submit to the rule of any one man, but discussed their common affairs in council. The pride and honour of individual families was to them more important than all else. Only under pressure of direst need did the Slav tribes join in choosing a common leader, and for this reason strangers were easily able to secure dominion over them.

Concerning the religion of the southern Slavs, our sources of information have little to tell us; they were polytheists, their chief deities were the heaven and the heavenly bodies. Of Svantovit and Perun, the deities of the northern Slavs, no traces are to be found. They worshipped

The Religion of the Southern Slavs

their gods in groves, mountains, and rocks. Victims were offered to them with song. Together with the gods they revered other beings, such as the Vilen or Samovilen (in Thracia, Samodiv), Budenice, Rojenice, Judi, Vijulici, spirits and female wizards (*brodnice*). Research, however, has not said the last word upon this point, and the personalities of many heathen gods are doubtful.

The districts south of the Danube and north of the Adriatic were under the rule of the Byzantine emperor, though Byzantine rulers were rarely able to exercise any real supremacy. Immigrant tribes from time to time nominally recognised the rights of the Byzantine emperors to these lands, and troubled themselves no further upon the matter. We may even question whether such immigrants always secured the consent of the emperor to their settlement upon Roman territory—a fact which the Byzantine historians continually reassert, for reasons easily intelligible. These peoples came into the country because they met with no resistance, and were the more readily inclined to acknowledge a vague supremacy, as they were themselves incapable of founding states.

It is not so much through their military power as through their diplomatic skill and wealth, and also through the disunion of the Slavs, that the Byzantines were able to retain, at any rate, a formal supremacy over these territories during many troublous periods. Notwithstanding the great success of the Slav colonisation, the Slavs

Where the Slavs Failed

never succeeded in founding an independent state in the Balkan territories; on this point both they and the Germans were far inferior to the Turco-Tartar races. Apart from the fact that these latter, by their introduction of cavalry service, with the use of the stirrup, possessed more formidable forces and obtained greater military success, they had also the further advantage of possessing the ideal of a strong state, though in roughest outline.

This they had learnt from the civilised nations of Asia. In Europe their appearance exercised some influence upon the military habits and constitutional organisation of the Germanic and Slav world, especially of the Goths; evidence of the fact is the migration of peoples, which was brought about by their arrival. It is not until this that the Germans and Slavs united into larger groups—that is, into states. It was, then, no mere chance that these peoples were the first to found kingdoms in the districts inhabited by the Slavs. They were the Huns, Avars, Bulgars, Chazars, Magyars, Patzinaks, Polovzes, Tartars, and Ottomans.

We know practically nothing of the relations of the Slavs to the state of the Huns. On the other hand, we learn a good deal of the political life of the Slavs in the sixth

THE SOUTHERN SLAV PEOPLES

century, when the second Turkish people, the Avars, founded a considerable empire in the district occupied by the Slavs. The supremacy of the Avars seems to have extended over the whole district of modern Hungary, Bohemia, and Moravia, the whole of Austria proper, the northern districts of the Elbe and Saale, and also southwards to the Danube over modern Dalmatia and Servia. As they were a people of giants, they were called by their neighbours simply Avars, or giants. Their rule was exceedingly oppressive. Fredegar's chronicle of the seventh century relates that the Slavs were forced to participate in every campaign of the Avars, and to fight, while the Avars drew up before the encampment. Agriculture was the sole work of the Slavs; other historians inform us that they were often used as draught-animals and beasts of burden. The Avars were the first foreign people whose permanent supremacy over the Slavs is historically established for the sixth century.

About the beginning of the seventh century the position of the Slavs improved, in consequence of a great defeat experienced by the Avars in 626. **Independent Slavonic State Established** The Avar Khan had undertaken a plundering raid on the Byzantine Empire, apparently as early as 623, and besieged Constantinople, when the Emperor Heraclius began war against the Persians; the campaign must have lasted some years. At this time, about the year 623, the Slavs on the Danube in the districts of Bohemia and Moravia revolted and founded an independent kingdom under the leadership of a certain Samo. When the Avar bands before Constantinople were destroyed in 626, the Avar power was considerably weakened for a whole generation.

The Slav tribes who had been hitherto subdued were now able to assert themselves. They joined Samo, and appointed him their king in 627, the more easily to oppose the attacks of the Langobardi, Bavarians, and Avars. Then was founded the first important independent Slav kingdom known to history; it lay in the western part of the modern Austrian monarchy. Samo maintained his position until 662 (according to others, until 658)—that is to say, for thirty-five years. After his death his empire disappears from the scene. We hear later of the Karantani as waging war with the Bavarians, and finally coming under Bavarian supremacy,

and, in the eighth century, of a Slovenian kingdom in Moravia and of another in Pannonia; whence we may conclude that the kingdom of Samo had undergone a process of disruption.

The foundation of the Avar kingdom was, moreover, of importance to Slav history for another reason. The oppressive rule of the Avars induced the Slavs to abandon their homes in large bodies, to migrate northwards or southwards, and there to occupy new districts. It was, therefore, at that time that the immigration of the Slavs to the Balkan territories began upon a larger scale. In other respects also the Slavs were now able to assert themselves more strongly. The defeat of the Avars in the year 626 had been of decisive importance both for the Slavs and for the Byzantines. Whole provinces now broke away from the Avars and were occupied by the Slavs.

Thus it is no mere coincidence that at this period two numerous Slav tribes appear in the north-west of the Balkan Peninsula. We hear that the Croats, who are said, upon evidence of the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenetos, to have come from the north, defeated the Avars about the year 626, and appeared as independent inhabitants of the country which they occupied. Their territories were bounded on the north by the Save and by a line running parallel to this river from the Unna to the sea, on the west by the Adriatic, on the south by the mouth of the Cettina River and by the Lake of Imoshi, on the south-east by a line of mountains running from this lake to the sources of the Verbas, and finally on the east by the Verbas itself. Their chief centres were Biograd—the modern Zaza Vecchia—and Bihac. These boundaries exist at the present day, though their value is purely ethnographical. It must also be remembered that the whole of the territory now occupied by the Croats and named after them belonged formerly to the Slovenians, and was called Slovenia. In course of time the Slovenian and Croatian tribes coalesced. Even at the present day a remembrance of these conditions is preserved by the name Slavonia, which denotes part of the Croatian kingdom, by the name of the Slovak tribe in Hungary, and by the old Pannonian-Slovenian kingdom. The Croats thus

absorbed the north-west of Bosnia and Dalmatia as far as Spalatro.

The Serbs soon followed the Croats across the Save, and, according to the Byzantine chroniclers, demanded and obtained from the emperor a place of settlement. They occupied the modern Bosnia with the exception of the Croatian portion, which is still known as Turco-Croatia. To them also belonged the greater part of Herzegovina, Southern Dalmatia, Northern Albania, Montenegro, Old Serbia (Novi-Bazar), the northern districts of the Prizrend pashalik, and the modern Serbia. At the present day we find the Serbs in these territories. Here they formed several larger and smaller principalities, mutually independent, known as Zupanates.


To begin with the most southern, we have the principality of Zeta or Duklja—from Dioclea, which is named after the birthplace of the Emperor Diocletian. This was the original home of the ruling family of the Nemanjids, under whose supremacy Serbia afterwards rose to the height of her power. This district was at all times a place of refuge for the champions of Servian independence. It was here that Montenegro developed, and succeeded in maintaining her freedom until our own days; it was only during the blood-stained period of Turkish supremacy that she lost some part of her independence.

From Cattaro to Ragusa extended Travunia or Konavlia, more or less corresponding with the area of the modern Trebinje in Herzegovina. From Ragusa to the Gulf of Stagno and inland as far as Narenta extended Zachluma, thus embracing a portion of Herzegovina about the Gatzko and Nevesinje. Neretva, or Paganja, extended from the gulf of Stagno to the mouth of the Cettina. The inhabitants, known as

Neretshans or Pagans, because for a long time they declined to accept Christianity, were dreaded pirates, and often fought victoriously against Venice.

To the east of Zeta, Travunia, and Zachluma lay Servia proper, the most extensive province of all, nearly corresponding to the modern Servia except for the fact that it included Bosnia, which broke away from it in course of time. Among the Zupanates belonging to Servia special mention may be made of that of Rasha or Rassa, the modern Novi-Bazar, known as Rascia in the mediæval sources for the history of Western Europe. This Croatian and Servian district, the modern Istria, Bosnia, Servia, Dalmatia, Montenegro, Albania, Herzegovina—roughly a third of the Balkan Peninsula—formed the Roman province of Dalmatia, with Salona as a central administrative point; under the Byzantine Empire


**The Slavs
Lose Their
Nationality**



SPECIMENS OF SLAVONIC JEWELLERY

these respective points bore the same name. The Slavs extended from this point over the whole peninsula, but were there to some extent deprived of their nationality. Only in Macedonia did they maintain their position although the Bulgarian race was here again in predominance. The Croatian and Servian tribal principalities of the north-west, the chieftains of which were known as Zupans, united only in case of great danger under a high Zupan. After long struggles the position of high Zupan became permanent, and the foundation of a more important empire was thus laid. Accurate information concerning the Croatian and Servian races is, however, wanting until the second half of the eighth century, and especially until the final destruction of the Avar kingdom by Charlemagne.

When the Avar supremacy was approaching its fall, another Finno-Ugrian people, the Bulgarians, crossed the Danube, entered upon a series of conquests among the Slavs of the peninsula, and even threatened Constantinople. Their immigration is of special importance for the history of the Balkan Slavs and of the Byzantine Empire. Neither the Byzantines nor the Slavs were able to offer any resistance. The Slavs, who lacked any bond of union, repeatedly surrendered. As early as the end of the seventh century a Bulgarian state was founded in the north-east of the peninsula, and not only maintained its position against the Greeks, but also seriously threatened the old imperial city. Until 627 the Persian danger had threatened Byzantium; this was followed by the Arab danger in 750; and now the young Bulgarian kingdom becomes prominent among the enemies of the Byzantine Empire. The boundaries of the new state rapidly increased, and by degrees most of the Balkan Slavs were federated under its supremacy. Under Bulgarian leadership the Slav tribes gradually coalesced to form one people. The higher civilisation of the



THE BEGINNING OF SLAVONIC LITERATURE

The light of religion and literature came to the Slavs from Byzantium, the apostles Constantine and Methodius, who went to Moravia in 861, inventing a script for the writing of the Slav language and translating the Gospels for the natives. This script is known as Glagolitic, and the above is a page from the beginning of St. Luke's Gospel in an ancient Glagolitic manuscript.

Slavs, however, resulted eventually in the imposition of their nationality upon the Bulgarians, who were much inferior in numbers, amounting at most to thirty or fifty thousand, including women and children; it was only their name that these warlike conquerors gave to the state and the people. A couple of centuries later there were no longer any distinctions between Slavs and Bulgarians; all were called Bulgarians but spoke the Slav language.

About the period of the Bulgarian immigration, which closes for the moment the migrations of peoples south of the Danube the Balkan Peninsula displayed a most motley mixture of populations. Side by side with the Romans and the Greeks, the latter of whom proudly called

themselves Romaioi, were the Slavs, who formed the majority, and among them for a considerable period remnants of the old inhabitants, the Thracians, from whom or from the Illyrians the Albanians are supposed to be descended. There are also to be found remnants of Goths and Gepids; in Croatia there were remnants of the Avars, and to

Founding the Bulgarian State these in the seventh century were added the Finno-Turkish tribe of the Bulgarians. The process of unification then began. Many tribes were absorbed by others, with the result that new nationalities were formed, such as the Roumanians. By the founding of the Bulgarian state and the imposition of the Slav nationality on the Bulgarians, the Slavs became preponderant both politically and ethnographically. Formerly the individual tribes lived in somewhat loose dependence upon Byzantium, and were the more easily able to preserve their nationality; now any member of the Slav kingdom was forced sooner or later to accept the Slav civilisation.

The Avar people had brought disaster upon the southern Slav tribes, whereas the immigration of the Bulgarians secured the predominance of the Slavs in the peninsula. The political life of the Balkan Slavs now centres round three main points—in the east the Bulgarian kingdom, in the centre the Servian, and in the west the Croatian principalities. Of Byzantine supremacy hardly a trace remained, except that a scanty tribute was transmitted to Byzantium. Only when some more powerful ruler occupied the throne of Constantinople were the reins drawn tighter or did the flame of war blaze up. At a later period the dependence upon Byzantium came to an end. Some influence upon the political affairs of the north-west portion of the Balkan Peninsula was exercised by the appearance of Charles the Great, who waged

Conquests of Charles the Great war with the Eastern empire in 788 concerning certain Byzantine possessions in Italy. He conquered both Istria and Dalmatia, and the Slovenians between the Drave and the Save paid him tribute until 812, when he renounced his claims to the districts extending to the Drave, under a peace with Byzantium. At the present day monuments dating from the period of Charles' supremacy over these countries are to be found in the museum at Agram.

The position of the Slav territories brought with it the consequence that Christianity was imposed upon them from three sides: on the one hand from Aquileia by Italian priests; on the northern side from Salzburg by Germans; and, finally, from Byzantium by Greek missionaries. There were other isolated attempts, but these may be neglected.

The original dissemination of Christian doctrine is here, as in other cases, wrapt in obscurity. Some missionaries came from the Frankish kingdom. Thus Columban, according to the narrative of his biographer, Jonas, after his expulsion from Burgundy by King Theoderic about 610, is said to have conceived the plan of preaching the Gospel to the Slavs in Noricum. About 630 Bishop Amandus, of Utrecht, entering the kingdom of Samo, determined to win the martyr's crown. He was followed about 650 by St. Emmeram with a priest, by name Vitalis, who was learned in the Slav language.

More fruitful in result was the activity of Bishop Rupert, of Worms, who founded a bishopric and monastery in the Noric Juvavia, Salzburg. Henceforward the diocese of Salzburg undertook the conversion of the Alpine Slavs, naturally under the protection of the Bavarian dukes. Especially good service was done by Bishop Virgilius, who occupied the see of Salzburg between 745 and 785. He sent out capable missionaries to Karantania and built churches there. The princes of Karantania themselves saw the necessity for accepting the Christian faith; Chotimir invited Bishop Virgilius to his court, though with no result.

The mission was energetically supported by Duke Tassilo II. (748-788) of Bavaria, the first duke to rule over Karantania. He cherished the idea of shaking off the Frankish yoke, and looked to Karantania for support, which he thought could best be gained by the dissemination of Christianity. He founded monasteries, or gave leave for such foundations under the express obligation of continuing the missions. Such foundations were Innichen and Kremsmünster. After the subjugation of Tassilo by the Franks in 788, the work of conversion was completed under Bishop Arno. He received the necessary full powers from the emperor and Pope, and completed the organisation of the Church by appointing a local bishop, by name

Theodoric. Once again it was a Wendish prince, Ingo, who supported his efforts.

The patriarch of Aquileia suddenly raised an objection to these proceedings, alleging that those districts belonged to his own diocese. It is true that we know nothing of any missionary energy displayed by Aquileia in that quarter. Yet missions there must have been from Aquileia, for in 810 Charles the Great was able to secure a compromise on terms which made the Drave a frontier line for the two claimants. Thus thenceforward the Slavs were divided between two dioceses.

The whole position was altered in the course of the ninth century, when Byzantium took the work of conversion seriously in hand. The Slav nation had for a long time opposed the first Christian missions because these were supported by their princes; when, however, they observed that by the acceptance of Christianity they had lost their freedom, they changed their opinion. If it were necessary to accept Christianity at all, it was better to take it from a quarter whence no danger of subjugation threatened. This was only possible

Eastern Empire at Enmity With Rome by adherence to the Greek Church. The East Roman Empire had in course of time fallen into enmity with Rome,

a dissension which extended to ecclesiastical affairs. In the ninth century Byzantium had resolved to act decisively against the West. From that period her influence increased and extended in a wide stream over the Balkan Peninsula. The Greek language, Greek writing and coinage, Greek art and literature, Greek law and military science, were disseminated among the Slavonic tribes; and of even greater importance was the missionary activity of the East Roman Church.

Of decisive importance for the fate of the Balkan Slavs and for the Slav nationality in general, indeed for Eastern Europe as a whole, was the moment when the patriarchal chair of Constantinople was occupied by Photius, one of the greatest scholars that the Byzantine state produced. Apart from the fact that he strove with all his might to further the revival of Greek antiquity and brought Byzantine culture to its zenith, his ecclesiastical policy was actuated by hostility to the Roman chair, and brought about the official division of the Byzantine Church from Rome. He won over many nations and vast tracts of country for the Byzan-

tine Church. During the imperial period, the Roman Empire had been divided into East and West only in respect of politics; this division was now superseded by the ecclesiastical separation. The whole of the East, with its wide northern territories, occupied by the Slavs henceforth recognised the predominance of the Byzantine

The Byzantine Church Succeeds Where Rome Fails Church and sided with Constantinople in the great struggle which now began. Of the move-

ments called forth in Europe at that time and for centuries later by the action of Photius, we can form but a vague idea in view of the scantiness of our records. A rivalry of unprecedented nature between the two worlds broke out along the whole line, and the great and vital point at issue was the question, which of the churches would be successful in winning over the yet unconverted Slavs.

To the action of this great patriarch alone the Byzantine Church owes the success which it achieved over the Romans in this struggle. In vain did Rome make the greatest efforts to maintain her position; success was possible for her only when German arms were at her disposal. Even to-day the Slavs reproach the Germans for attempting to secure their subjugation under the cloak of the Christian religion. But the German emperor and princes were only pieces upon the great chessboard, moved by unseen hands from Rome. At a later period the German princes marched eastward, not to convert, but to conquer.

Almost at this time two Slav princes sent ambassadors to Byzantium and asked that the work of conversion might begin; they were the Moravian Ratislav and the Bulgarian Boris. It is possible that the prince of the Khazars had done the same two years earlier. Photius began the work of conversion with great prudence. Two brothers from Thessalonica, learned in the Slav language and experienced in missionary work, were chosen to preach the Gospel

Preaching the Gospel to the Slavs to the Slavs. It was decided, however, definitely to separate from Rome the nationalities won over to the Greek Church,

and for this purpose Byzantium, in opposition to the Roman use, which allowed the liturgy to be recited only in Latin, laid down the principle that each people might conduct public worship in its own language. Thus, outside the three sacred languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the Slav was

recognised as of equal importance, as had been at an earlier period the Syrian, Coptic, and Armenian tongues.

Constantine and Methodius, the two Slav apostles, went forth to their destination, Moravia, in 863. They invented a special form of writing for the Slavs, that which is nowadays known as Glagolitic ;

Apostles who Founded Slavonic Literature

they translated the sacred books into the Slavonic tongue, and thus became the founders of Slavonic literature. They organised the Slav Church, founded schools, had churches built, and travelled over the whole country, everywhere carrying the light of civilisation and of the new religion. "And full of delight were the Slavs when they heard the wonders of God in their own language," says the old Slav legend concerning Methodius.

When, shortly afterwards, divine service was recited in the Slav language in the churches of Moravia and Pannonia, the German clergy were stricken with fear, as they now saw that the East, the field of their future missionary activity, was lost to them. They expostulated forthwith both to the German emperor and to Rome, enlarging upon the danger which might threaten both powers from this side. In order that their work might not be checked at its outset, the two apostles went to Rome to explain their position and to gain confirmation for their work. Upon their return journey they entered the Pannonian kingdom at Lake Platten, where Kozel was ruler. The two brothers were able to win over the prince to the Gospel so entirely that he began to read the Slav books and ordered several youths to do the same. When the apostles of the Slavs had won over the Pope to their cause, and Methodius was made Bishop of Moravia, Kozel sent an embassy to Rome requesting that the Pope would also place his principality under the new bishop. The Pope thereupon raised Methodius to the position

Croatians and the Christianity of the Slavs

of archbishop, with a seat in Syrmium, and united the new principality to the old diocese of Syrmia. Croatia on the Save was also placed under this Pannonian archbishopric. The Slav liturgy then extended with marvellous rapidity, and the prestige of the Bavarian clergy sank so low that their arch-priest was forced to return to Salzburg in 870.

The Bulgarian prince Boris hesitated for a long time between Rome and Byzantium ;

and it is doubtful whether his final decision in favour of Byzantium was not dictated by the political object which had influenced Ratislav, the prospect of securing his independence of Germany. Apart from the advantage conferred by the Slav liturgy, his action was decided by the further fact that so many Greek Christians were contained among his people that the acceptance of Greek Christianity seemed inevitable. Finally, he may also have acted in the interests of that Bulgarian policy which aimed at the conquest of Constantinople. For the conversion of the Bulgarians, the advice of both missionaries seems to have been sought. At the same time the Croatians accepted the Slav form of Christianity. It was now impossible for the Servian tribes to stand aloof. We do not, however, know when they came over. Some are said to have accepted Christianity as early as the seventh century under the Emperor Heraclius ; but it was not until a new band of scholars and priests came into the country from Pannonia that the Slav Church became capable of development. After the death of Methodius, in 885, the Slav Church was

**Period of
Literary
Activity** no longer able to maintain its position in Pannonia ; Svato-pluk, the successor of Ratislav, drove out the disciples of Methodius and placed his country under the German Church. The Slav clergy from Moravia found a hospitable reception in Bulgaria, and their activity created the Bulgarian Slav literature. The Bulgarian throne was then occupied by Symeon, the son of Boris (893-927), who was able to turn the knowledge and the powers of the new arrivals to the best account. He lost no time in commanding Bulgarian translations of the Greek authors, ecclesiastical as well as secular. Thus, for instance, the monk Gregor translated the chronicle of John Malala, and added to it the Old Testament history and a poem upon Alexander ; fragments only survive of the Greek original, whereas the Bulgarian translation contains the whole work.

The existence of a Slav literature, the most important of that day in Europe after the Græco-Roman, won over the whole of the Slav nationality to the Byzantine Church and facilitated its conversion. The remaining Balkan Slavs now gave in their adherence to Bulgarian literature, and Bulgaria became the middle-man of culture between Constantinople

THE SOUTHERN SLAV PEOPLES

and the northern Slavs. The Balkan Slavs gave the watchword to the other members of their great nationality. The connection of the Slavs with Greek civilisation was secured by the fact that the above-mentioned Constantine, Bishop of Velica (or Bishop Clemens of Drenovica), replaced the inconvenient Glagolitic script by an adaptation of Greek writing made for the Slavs and augmented by the addition of several new signs representing sounds peculiar to the Slav language. This was the Cyrillic writing.


A common literature, civilisation, and religion brought Greeks and Slavs closer together, until they formed one group united by a common civilisation and divided from the West. This event was of decisive influence upon the future of the whole Slav nationality. The southern Slavs in particular inherited all the advantages and all the defects of the Greek character, nor was it politically alone that they shared the fate of the Byzantine Empire. The sloth, the indifference, the stagnation, and the other defects which characterised the Greek Church are consequently reflected in the society and culture of the Slavs at every turn. The want of organising power and of discipline which characterises the Greek Church has permanently influenced the political

life of the Slavs. For the Slavs were devoid of any leading political idea, and clung to the principles of the slowly decaying Byzantine Empire. Divided as they were into a number of tribes opposed to union, they were bound, sooner or later, to fall a prey to some powerful conqueror.

The only bond of union between the Slav races in the Balkan Peninsula was Christianity and the Græco-Slav civilisation. The Bulgarian kingdom advanced with rapid strides, as it rose to power towards the gates of Byzantium, until it entered upon a mighty struggle with the Emperor John Tzimiscēs in 971 and was finally conquered in 1018 by Basil II.; meanwhile, the history of the Croatian and Servian tribes comes but slowly into view from the historical background of the north-west. The part played by the Servian and Croatian Zupans is but very small. For the purpose of maintaining their independence they wavered between Bulgaria and Byzantium, ranging themselves now on one side, now on the other. Many Servian and Croatian principalities were subjugated by the Bulgarians. After the conquest of Bulgaria they were forced to join the Byzantine kingdom, and to secure themselves against aggression from this side they turned to Rome.



SERVIAN BANDITS RESTING AT A MOUNTAIN INN



HISTORICAL MAPS OF TURKEY AND SURROUNDING COUNTRIES FROM THE 14TH TO END OF THE 17TH CENTURY



CROATIA AND ITS WARRIOR RACE THE WORLD-RENOWNED REPUBLIC OF RAGUSA

THE history of Croatia begins at an earlier date than that of Servia; especially is this true of the coast land occupied by the Croats, which was also known to the Italians as Slavonia. The year 634 is the date generally given to the immigration of the Croats. They were subdued by the Franks, and after the disruption of the Carolingian Empire they submitted to the Greek Emperor Basil I. about 877. About the year 900 they once again secured their independence. Prince Muntimir is said to have laid the foundation of this success. Among the Croats of the coast land we find an independent prince as early as the ninth century, by name Borna, who bears the title *Dux Liburniæ et Dalmatiæ*. The central point of this duchy lay in the North about Klis, Nona, Zara Vecchia, and Knin. In the ninth century Christianity was introduced with the Slav liturgy and the Glagolitic script, and in 879 a bishopric was founded at Nona by the duke Branimir. The Glagolitic script was forbidden to the Roman clergy by the Synod of Spalatro in 924, but was afterwards allowed by Innocent IV. in 1248, and is still in use in the churches in that district. In 1898 Pope Leo XIII. issued fresh regulations concerning the use of Glagolitic and of the Slav liturgy in Dalmatia and the coast land.

The Servian chieftain Michael did not secure the title of king from Gregory VII. until the eleventh century, whereas the Croatian chief Timislav was granted that title, also by Rome, as early as 926. In other respects the balance of power between Croatia and Servia on the frontier line was continually changing; at one time Servian tribes were subjugated by the Croats, and at other times Croatian districts were conquered by the Serbs.

In the tenth century Croatia became a formidable power. The islands and coast towns occupied by the Roman population paid yearly tribute to the Croatian princes with the consent of the East

Roman emperor, in order to secure immunity from attacks upon their trade; the Venetians also paid tribute to the Croats for the same reason, down to the end of the tenth century. According to Constantine Porphyrogenetos (about 950), the Croats, under the princes Krjesmir and Miroslav, the successors of Timislav, were able to place in the field 100,000 infantry and 60,000 cavalry, and possessed 180 ships of war. Soon, however, Venice grew so strong that the payment of tribute was refused by the Doge Peter II. Orsello, and in the year 1000 he conquered the Croats and Narentanes and assumed the title of Duke of Dalmatia; this was the first occasion on which Venice acquired possession of the Dalmatian coast. In order to save their throne the Croatian ruling family formed an alliance with the commercial republic. Kresimir, the legitimate heir to the throne, married Hicela, the daughter of the Doge, and bore the title of King of Croatia and Dalmatia from the year 1059.

These events aroused anxiety and enmity in the Hungarian court, which found itself forestalled in its attempts to secure a footing on the Adriatic Sea and to conquer the coast of Dalmatia; the Hungarians also recognised that the Venetian republic had become a dangerous rival. The house of Arpad succeeded in negotiating a marriage between the daughter of King Geisa I. and the Croatian duke, Svonimir, who at that time, 1076, had been crowned king by the papal legate of Gregory VII., and had thus admitted

his position as a vassal of the papal chair. In 1088, when Svonimir died without children, his widow is said to have called in her brother Ladislaus. He conquered the interior of Croatia in 1091, but was unable to advance to the sea, because Hungary was herself threatened at that time by the Cumanians. He entrusted the government of the conquered district

to his nephew Almus. Croatia thus became an appanage of the Hungarian Empire, whose fate it henceforward shared. Hungary was thus necessarily forced into hostility with Venice, as it was committed to an attempt to conquer the Dalmatian coast, then in Venetian hands. From this time forward that part of Croatia

Dalmatia an Apple of Discord lying next the sea—Dalmatia—formed for centuries the apple of discord between Hungary and Venice. If Byzantium sought to assert her rights, she would have had to compose the quarrels of Hungary and Venice.

While the Servian state succeeded in maintaining its independence until 1389, the excitable, military, and highly gifted Croatian people had been made tributary to their neighbours as early as the end of the eleventh century; while Servia had been able easily to enrich herself at the expense of the declining power of Byzantium and Bulgaria, Croatia had to deal with the rising state of Hungary and with Venice, at that time the first commercial power in Europe. Notwithstanding these differences, Croatia would probably have emerged victoriously from the struggle, had she not been weakened by internal dissensions. The interior of Croatia remained united to Hungary. Venice and Hungary struggled for a long time and with varying success to secure the mastery of the Croatian seaboard which was known as Dalmatia. In the fourteenth century the Bosnian king, Tvrtko, had secured a temporary supremacy over Dalmatia and assumed the title of "Rex Croatiae et Dalmatiae." Even after his death in 1391 Bosnia retained her hold of part of Southern Dalmatia, which thenceforward bore the name of Herzegovina. In the fourteenth century other claimants for the possession of Dalmatia appeared in the Angevin dynasty of Naples, until King Ladislaus sold the province of Zadar

Venice Secures Dalmatia to Venice for 100,000 ducats, and thus decided the struggle for Dalmatia in favour of Venice; after that period many states voluntarily submitted to the Venetian rule, while Hungarian influence steadily decreased.

The consequence was that these two related tribes entered upon divergent careers. While the Serbs came under Byzantine influence and accepted the Greek Church and civilisation, Croatia,

united to the West, lived under wholly different conditions. The frontier between the Servian and Croatian settlements is, therefore, the frontier between the East and West of Europe, between the Greek and the Roman worlds.

Different courses of development were also followed by the two parts of Croatia. While the coast line, within the area of the Roman world, shared in Roman culture and economic development, the interior of Croatia remained part of Hungary, and steadily declined in consequence.

In religious matters also the two parts of the country were divided when Ladislaus the Saint, of Hungary, founded a bishopric in Agram and made it subordinate to the archbishopric of Gran, in 1095. In the year 1153 Agram was raised to the dignity of an independent bishopric. In the diocese of Agram the Slavonic ritual was gradually driven out by the Latin, though the Slavonic maintained its ground in Dalmatia, after Innocent IV. had recognised its equality with the Latin ritual in 1248. At the present day the Slav liturgy is allowed throughout the diocese of Zeng, while in the rest of Croatia only the epistles and the gospels may be read in the Slav tongue. In the Hungarian portion of Croatia adherents of the Eastern Church certainly maintained their existence, and even multiplied during the Turkish period after Suleiman II., owing to the influx of Bosnian and Servian fugitives; at the present day there are in the country thirteen monasteries of the eastern Greek Church. Notwithstanding this fact, Croatia has remained a distinctly Catholic country.

Among the towns, the most important, with the exception of the ancient Sissek, which dates from Roman times, was Kreutz, where the Hungarian king Kolo-man is said to have concluded his pact with the Croats in 1097, and where, at a later period, the Croatian national assembly was accustomed to meet. With these exceptions, town life developed comparatively late. For example, Varasdin secured municipal privileges from Andreas II. in 1209. Bela IV. was the first to promote town life by granting new privileges, a step to which he was chiefly forced by the devastations of the Mongols in 1224. At the head of the Croatian government was a ban; this dignitary was originally



GENERAL VIEW OF THE ANCIENT CITY-STATE OF RAGUSA, IN DALMATIA

This, one of the most picturesque towns on the Dalmatian coast, had a long and remarkable history in the Middle Ages as an independent city-state under republican government. Its merchants held an extensive trade throughout the east.

equivalent to a viceroy, and has retained his prestige to our own days, notwithstanding all the restrictions which the office has undergone. In the course of time the ban was appointed by the king, on the proposal of the estates, and was solemnly inducted into Agram by their deputies, accompanied by 1,000 riders, the "army of the banate." Holding in his right hand the sceptre as the sign of his knightly power, and in his left hand the standard as the sign of military power, he took his oath to the estates in the Church of St. Mark, according to the formula dictated by the royal plenipotentiary. The powers of the ban were great. He was able to call an assembly of the estates on his own initiative, without previously securing the king's consent. He presided over the national assembly and signed its decrees.

He was the supreme judge, from whose decisions appeals might be made only to the king; he was the commander-in-chief of the collective Croatian troops, and in time of war led the army of the banate in person; coins were even struck bearing his name. In view of these facts, Lewis the Great divided Croatia between several bans in 1359; this, however, was only a temporary expedient, introduced to

provide the strong frontier government required to meet the Turkish danger.

The chief legislative body of Croatia was from ancient times the national assembly, which, previous to the union with Hungary, was summoned by the king, and after that union by the ban. It was originally held in Dalmatia, and after the transference of the central power northwards in some one or other of the

Croatian towns, such as Agram, Kreutz, Warasdin, Cakathurn, or Krapina. The most important powers of the Croatian assembly enabled it to deal with questions of legislation, taxation, the levying of troops, the choice of officials, and administrative details. The attempts of Lewis the Great to unite the financial administration of Croatia with that of Hungary resulted in the revolt of Croatia after his



SEAL OF THE REPUBLIC OF RAGUSA

death; the plan was consequently abandoned by his son-in-law, King Sigismund.

Notwithstanding these privileges, Croatia never ran a steady course of development. It was a frontier land, and was involved, to its detriment, in every war. Hence it required another kind of supervision than that which Hungary was able to provide. Croatia suffered more particularly in the Turkish period, and it

then became wholly obvious that Hungary was unequal to the task of administering the country. The land became utterly desolate, and the taxable wealth of Croatia steadily declined. At a former period the county of Kreutz contained some 12,000 taxable houses, while in the sixteenth century there were hardly 3,000 to be found in the whole country.

Turks Oust Venetians from Dalmatia

In the Venetian province of Dalmatia towns and districts enjoyed a certain measure of self-government under voivodes, rectors, and priors. Corporate life in the towns had flourished on the Adriatic since Roman times. Prosperity increased, and civilisation consequently attained a high stage of development. However, the Venetian supremacy came to an end after 1522; the decisive blow was struck in 1539, when the Ottomans seized the greater part of Dalmatia, while Venice was able to maintain her hold only of the islands. At that period Turkey was at the height of her power. Hungary herself was conquered, and in Pesth the crescent waved above the cross after 1541. Thus both parts of Croatia shared the same fate.

Only one small municipality on the extreme south of the Dalmatian coast land was able to maintain a measure of independence. This was the commercial Slav republic of Ragusa. The district of the modern Ragusa coincides with that of the Greek city-state of Epidaurus, the last mention of which occurs in the letters of Gregory I. During the Byzantine period it formed a part of the Thema of Dalmatia. After the immigration of the Slavs, the Romans, according to the account of Constantine VII. Porphyrogennetos, were driven out of the town, and founded hard by upon an inaccessible rock a new town, known in Latin as Ragusium, and in Slav as Dubrovnik. It was the seat of the Byzantine strategos, and of the bishop who was subordinate to the archbishop in Spalatro. In the twelfth century an independent archbishopric was founded here. The "Gens Ragusea" became more and more independent, and at the close of the eleventh century joined the Normans in fighting against Byzantium.

The Rock Republic of Ragusa

At the head of this city-state of Ragusa there appeared in the twelfth century "consules" and "comites," although the district was nominally under the rule of the Byzantine "Dux Dalmatiæ et Diocliæ." The town was even forced to wage war against Venice, which would have been glad to occupy Dalmatia and Ragusa. After the death of the Emperor Manuel in 1180, the general confusion of political affairs enabled Stefan Nemanja of Servia to threaten the district; the town then placed itself under the protection of the Norman kings of the Two Sicilies. After the conquest of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204 the Venetian fleet appeared before Ragusa, which was then forced to acquiesce in the supremacy of Venice. The people of Ragusa were left in possession of their old city government, only from this time forward a Venetian "comes" resided in the town. Under Venetian supremacy the relations of Ragusa and Servia became particularly friendly; and the rulers of the latter country several times presented the republic with important grants of land. After the death of Dusan, in the period of the war between the Magyars and Venetians for Dalmatia, Venice was forced, in 1358, to renounce her claims to the whole district between Quarnero and Albania; and Ragusa came under Hungarian rule, until, in 1526, it was incorporated with Turkey after the battle of Mohacs. The life of the town had long ago lost its national characteristics. Shut in between two Servian tribes, the Zachlumians and Narentanes, it was open to such strong Slav influence that at the beginning of the eleventh century the Roman element was wholly in the minority.

Great Trade of Ragusa

This Slav commercial republic was known throughout the East by reason of its extensive trade; even the Arab geographer Edrisi mentions Ragusa. The series of commercial treaties concluded by the town begins with an agreement with Pisa in 1169; this was followed by one with the Ban Kulin of Bosnia in 1189, and by another with Bulgaria in 1230. Especially favourable were the privileges granted by the rulers of Servia, in return for which the people of Ragusa paid a yearly tribute—a thousand purple cloths and fifty ells of scarlet cloth every year on the day of St. Demetrius. To Stefan Dusan they paid only five hundred purple cloths, and even this he renounced in favour of the monastery of Chilandar, on Mount Athos, a regulation which remained in force until the French put an end to the republic in 1808. Bosnia received five hundred

CROATIA AND ITS WARRIOR RACE

purple cloths and Hungary five hundred ducats. Almost the whole trade of the Balkan Peninsula was in the hands of the Ragusans, who outstripped even the Venetians and Genoese. Colonies from Ragusa were to be found in many Servian and Bulgarian towns. The flag of Ragusa was to be seen on every sea, and in every important town of the East its factories and consulates were to be found. It was not until the period of Turkish supremacy that the commerce of Ragusa began to decay, notwithstanding the various charters in the Slav language which it received from the sultans; it was forced, however, to pay a tribute of 12,500 ducats.

The prosperity of this little state naturally caused a considerable increase of culture in the fifteenth century. Mathematics and astronomy, and, later on, literature, and especially Slav poetry, were here brilliantly represented. Ragusa also exercised a strong influence upon the culture of the other Slavs in the Balkan Peninsula, and was known as the Slavonic Athens.

During the Turkish period Hungarian Croatia suffered nearly the same fate as Servia; the country became desolate. When, however, the Croats, independently



PEASANT TYPES OF CROATIA

of Hungary, raised the house of Hapsburg to the throne of Croatia in 1527, the country became of primary importance in Austrian politics; Austrian rulers recognised its value as a bulwark against the Turks. The warlike Croats soon became the most valuable support of the empire, not only against the Ottomans, but also against other powerful enemies in the west of Europe.

The fortification of the country began in the sixteenth century. The castles and citadels of the Croatian magnates were transformed into fortresses, and other strongholds were also placed along the frontier at important points. Such of the population as still remained in the district were then called in for military service, and fugitives from the neighbouring Turkish countries met with a hearty reception in Croatia.

Thus by degrees the deserted territory was repopulated. As, however, Croatia was not herself equal to these military burdens, and as, upon the other hand, neighbouring countries gained all the advantage from the military occupation of the frontier, it was only reasonable that Carniola, Styria, and Carinthia should contribute their share of the expense. Such was the beginning of the Croatian military frontier;



CROATIAN PEASANT WOMEN

at an early period Lewis I. had created a "capitanate" in Zeng, and Matthias Corvinus had settled fugitives upon the frontier.

The Archduke Charles performed valuable service in organising the military frontier of Styria. He constructed the great fortresses of Karlstadt, in 1579, and Varasdin, in 1595. The land on the far side of the Kulpa to the Adriatic Sea and the Slavonic frontier to the Save were thus fortified and divided into two generalates; one was the Croatian, or Karlstadt, frontier, the other the Slavonic, Windish, or Varasdin frontier. The point chiefly kept in view in constructing these fortifications was the defence of the waterways, especially the lines of the Save, Kulpa, and Drave, which had long been used by the Turks. Although by the Croatian constitution the ban was the commander-in-chief of all the troops on foot in Croatia, yet the military organisation of the frontier tended to make that district immediately dependent upon the empire; both frontiers were under the administration of the Council of War at Graz.

The Croatian estates certainly objected, for they invariably regarded the military frontier as an integral part of Croatia; they secured the concession that upon occasion the authorities upon the frontier would be ordered to act in concert with the ban.

To begin with, the foreign commanders did not readily submit to these arrangements; apart from the question of the ban, the estates of Carniola and Styria also supported the independence of the military frontier, for the reason that the frontier had already become a no-man's land, and was retained only by great sacrifices on the part of the monarchy, while Croatia had lost her right to it.

Notwithstanding the Croatian claims, the military frontier became a special crown land, and obtained rights

Military Service in Croatia of its own from the time of Ferdinand III. In accordance with these rights the peasants were free, and subject to the emperor alone. From the age of eighteen every frontier inhabitant was liable to military service, and was obliged to keep himself ready to take up arms for defence. The land was divided into districts or "capitanates." Every parish chose an overseer.

All the parishes composing a "capitanate" chose their common judge, who, like the parish overseer, was obliged to be confirmed in office by those under his command. As the Greek Church numbered most adherents among the population, it obtained equal rights with the Catholic Church.

The Croatian estates organised the country between the Kulpa and Unna on similar principles, and as the ban was here commander-in-chief, this frontier was known as the frontier of the banate. In the peace of Karlovitz in 1699, when the districts of Croatia and Slavonia, once occupied by the Turks, were given back, a third generalate was instituted in Essek for the newly freed Slavonia; however, in 1745 three Slavonic counties were separated and handed over to the civil administration.

The independence of the military province of Croatia was a matter of great importance to the Austrian rulers, as here they had the entire population forming a standing army always ready for war. Hence the Emperor Charles IV. began a

Croatia Under Austria reorganisation of all the Croatian military frontiers. The generalate of Essek was divided into three regiments, that of Varasdin into two, that of Karlstadt into four, and the frontier of the banate into two. In the eighteenth century military frontiers were organised, after the manner of the Croatian, along the whole Turkish frontier as far as Transylvania, the frontier of Szekl in 1764, and that of Wallachia in 1766. In times of peace it was necessary only to make provision for outpost duty in the cardakes standing along the Turkish frontier. Although foreign soldiers were removed from the frontier on principle, yet the official posts were for the most part occupied by foreigners, and the official language was entirely German. Every frontier inhabitant was liable to military service from the age of seventeen to sixty. The population was secure in the possession of their land; and the military spirit of the Croatian frontier population grew even stronger. Their privileges inspired them with a decided prejudice against the régime of the banate, under which the territorial lords heavily oppressed their subjects, and the established Church was the Roman Catholic.



SERVIAN ERA OF INDEPENDENCE

SERVIA, MONTENEGRO, AND BOSNIA UNTIL THE TURKISH SUPREMACY

AFTER the conquest of Bulgaria by Byzantium and the occupation of Croatia by Hungary and Venice respectively, the Servian race alone of all Slav peoples in the Balkan Peninsula retained any kind of independence, although they were by no means as yet a united state. At all times and in all places small nations have federated only when threatened by some external danger; thus it was that the Russian and Lithuanian states arose, and such is the history of all the Western European states, and of Servia among them. Under the great Tsar Symeon Bulgaria so devastated the Servian districts that they had to be re-colonised by returning fugitives, and part of the Servian tribes were forced to recognise Bulgarian supremacy.

In the tenth century the Zupan Ceslav succeeded for the first time in uniting several Servian tribes for a common struggle against the Bulgarians. After the destruction of the Bulgarian Empire by Basil II, Byzantine supremacy over the whole peninsula was established with a vigour which had been unprecedented since the time of Justinian I., and this state of things continued, under the dynasty of the Comneni, till the end of the twelfth century. The boundless oppression of the government often, however, caused revolts among the Serbs. The High Zupan Michael applied to Rome for support, received thence the title of king, and maintained his independence of Byzantium for some time. The help of the Hungarians was also not despised. A prominent figure about 1120 is Uros, or Bela Uros, the Zupan of Rassa, whose family belonged to Zeta; he entered upon friendly relations with the Hungarians, married his daughter to Bela II., and helped the Magyars to secure possession of Bosnia. From the Rama, a tributary of the Narenta on the south of Bosnia,

the Arpads now took the title of "King of Rama."

Of even more importance for Servian history is the rule of the son of Uros, the famous Stefan I. Nemanja, who was also born in Zeta, the cradle of his race. Although the youngest of his family, he aimed at the principality of Rassa, and also at the general supremacy, which he was able to secure with the help of the Byzantines. Though he had been baptised into the Western Church, he underwent a repetition of the ceremony according to the customs of the Eastern Church when he had arrived in Rassa, in order to secure the favour of the clergy and the people.

In the year 1165 the Emperor Manuel I. confirmed his position as High Zupan and gave him a piece of land, in return for which Nemanja swore fidelity to him. In the year 1173 Nemanja defeated his relations and secured the obedience of the refractory Zupans. In this way he founded one uniform hereditary and independent state. That process was here completed which was going on at the same time in Bohemia, Poland, and Russia. And in these states also families began to rule according to the law of seniority—that is to say, the eldest member of the ruling family exercised a supremacy over the rest until the transition to hereditary monarchy had been completed. Princes of the royal family who had hitherto enjoyed equal rights now became officials of the royal power. In Servia this change was completed at a much earlier date than in other Slav countries.

Nemanja also took in hand the organisation of the Servian Church. Converted to the Greek faith, he built monasteries and churches, suppressed the Roman faith, and cruelly persecuted the widely-spread Bulgarian sect of the Bogumiles, with the object of securing a uniform religion throughout his own state. The

Eastern Church thus became established in Servia, and the Eastern form of worship became the national worship, so that religion and nationality formed an undivided idea. At an earlier period the Servian churches and bishoprics had been subordinate to the Roman archbishopric of Spalatro, and afterwards to that of

The First Eastern Archbishop

Antivari; now Eastern bishoprics and an archbishopric were founded for Servia alone. The king's youngest son, Rastka, was appointed the first Eastern archbishop in Servia—at the Synod of Nicæa in 1221—under the name of Sava. He divided the land into twelve bishoprics, and bestowed episcopal rank on none but Servians. Zica was made the residence of the Servian archbishops; at a later period Sava carried thither the remains of his imperial father, Nemanja, from Mount Athos; here, too, Servian kings were in future to be crowned, and this was realised in the case of Peter I. on October 9th, 1904. Sava also founded monasteries in Servia, all under the "rule" of Saint Basil, which he had found in force at Athos. He enjoyed immense prestige, and was highly honoured as the first national saint of Servia. In the year 1235 the independence of the Servian Church was recognised by the Greeks.

This ecclesiastical alliance did not, however, prevent Nemanja from attacking Byzantium when the advantage of his own state was in question. Immediately after the death of the Emperor Manuel, in 1180, he conquered, in alliance with the Hungarian king, Bela III., those Servian districts which had fallen under Byzantine supremacy. He then renewed his friendly relations with the emperor, and even secured the hand of the emperor's niece, Eudoxia, for his own son Stefan, an alliance which brought legitimacy and special prestige to his house. It seems that the ambitious Nemanja hoped to

Byzantium Weakened by Quarrels

bring Byzantium within his power. The circumstances were favourable to such an attempt. Servia was the only independent state in the Balkan Peninsula, while Byzantium was weakened by quarrels about the succession. Nemanja, however, did not feel himself sufficiently strong for the attempt. At that period the Emperor Frederick I. Barbarossa came to Nisch on his crusade. The Servian prince appeared before him, and a chronicler

assures us that Nemanja was willing to accept his country from Barbarossa as a fief. The emperor, however, who did not wish to arouse the animosity of the Greeks, declined to entertain the proposal.

In the year 1195 Nemanja, apparently with the object of securing the supremacy of his house, abdicated in favour of his eldest son Stefan, the second Nemanja, to whom he had already given the Byzantine title of despot. His second son, Vukan, received his hereditary district of Zeta. Nemanja himself retired into the monastery of Studenitza, a foundation of his own, under the title of "Symeon the Monk"; afterwards he went to Mount Athos, and died in 1200 at the monastery of Chilander, which was also of his foundation. A struggle for the succession burst out between his sons, Vukan attempting to secure support in Hungary, and especially in Rome. Stefan also made applications to that quarter, and was crowned by the papal legate in 1217; he assumed the title "King of Servia, Diocletia, Travunia, Dalmatia, and Chlum." This step, however, cost him his entire popularity in the country. The

Servia Under Hungarian Supremacy

Archbishop Sava had repeatedly interposed in the quarrels of the brothers; Stefan now asked for further action of the kind. Sava crowned him in 1222 with a crown sent by the Byzantine Empire, at a great popular assembly, at which he read before him the articles of faith of the Eastern Church. The Hungarian king, Emerich, had availed himself of these quarrels to bring Servia under his supremacy. In 1202 he occupied Servia and assumed the title of "Rex Rasciæ"; but a struggle with his brother Andreas forced him to leave Servia. Stefan maintained his position until his death, in 1224. Since that time no Servian ruler ventured to break away from the Eastern Church, although many entered into connection with Rome.

Of the descendants of Nemanja, Milutin, otherwise named Stefan IV., or Uros II. (1275 or 1281 to 1320), began a career of ruthless conquest; he had no hesitation in forwarding his plans by repeated marriages with Byzantine, Bulgarian, and Hungarian princesses, with a corresponding series of divorces. He captured Greek provinces and maintained his possession of them even after the death of the Emperor Michael VIII. Palæologus in 1282. He



AN "ORTHODOX" SERVIAN WOMAN



YOUNG WOMAN OF BOSNIA



MONTENEGRIN OF THE "OLD GUARD"



A BOSNIAN FARMER

TYPES OF BOSNIANS, SERVIANS AND MONTENEGRINS

advanced as far as Athos. He obtained Bosnia from Hungary without striking a blow, as the dowry of his first wife. He also secured the favour of the Pope, whom he was able to keep in hand with empty promises. As he had no legitimate male heirs, he conceived the idea of uniting his empire with the Byzantine, in which plan

Servia's Fame Throughout Western Europe he was supported by the Empress Irene, his second mother-in-law. Naturally he and no other was to have been emperor, and her children were to succeed him. Under him and under his son Stefan V.—Stefan IV. if we begin the series of Stefan kings in 1222—Uros III., who bore the nickname Decanski, Servia became famous not only in the Balkan territories, but also throughout Western Europe.

Meanwhile, however, Bulgaria had recovered from her downfall at the end of the twelfth century, and was waging a successful war with Byzantium. The powerful Servian kingdom now stood in the way of her further development. A struggle between the two for supremacy could only be a question of time. In the year 1323 the Bulgarian Boyars chose the Despot Michael of Widdin as their tsar; with him begins the supremacy of the Sismanides of Widdin, the last dynasty of Tirnovo. The new tsar began friendly relations with Servia, and married Anna, the daughter of Milutin, with the object of vigorously opposing the Byzantines and other enemies. Soon, however, the situation was changed. Michael divorced Anna about 1325 and married the sister of Andronicus III. of Byzantium.

It was only by the intervention of the Servian bishop and chronicler Daniel that war with Servia was avoided on this occasion; however, in 1330 it broke out. Michael brought about a great alliance between the Byzantines, Bulgarians, Roumanians, Tartars and Bessarabians. The Servian king advanced by forced marches

Defeat and Plunder of Bulgarians against the allies, and suddenly attacked them on June 28th at Velbuzd. His army included 300 German mercenaries in armour; and Dusan, the son of Stefan, fought at the head of a chosen band. The Bulgarians were routed and their camp was plundered. Stefan contented himself with raising Stefan, the son of his sister Anna, who had been divorced by Michael, to the position of tsar, as Sisman II., and evacuated Bulgaria. Servia now held the

predominant position in the Balkan Peninsula.

Stefan, the conqueror of Velbuzd, met with a sad fate. He had been formerly blinded by his father, Milutin, and now came to a terrible end. His Boyars revolted under the leadership of Dusan and strangled him, at the age of sixty, though shortly before he had appointed his ungrateful son to the position of "younger king." Thus on September 8th, 1331, Stefan Dusan ascended the throne at the age of nineteen. Of desperate courage on the battlefield, Dusan also possessed all the qualities of a statesman. While Milutin confined his aspirations to a union of the Byzantine and Servian kingdoms, Dusan dreamed of a larger Servia which should embrace all the Balkan territories. Turning to account the weakness of the Byzantine and Bulgarian Empires he conquered Albania, Macedonia, Thessaly and Epirus between 1336 and 1340 and in 1345; even the Greeks, weary of civil war, are said to have invited his supremacy. In 1346 he assumed the title of tsar and had the youthful Uros crowned king, entrusting to him the administration of Servia proper.

Zenith of Servia's Power In his documents we meet with the title "Stefan, Tsar and supreme ruler of Servia and Greece, of Bulgaria and Albania."

His title of emperor was also to the benefit of the Servian Church, as the previous dependency of the archbishopric of Servia upon the Byzantine patriarch was not wholly compatible with the existence of a Servian Empire. Hence in 1346 Stefan Dusan raised the Servian archbishop to the position of patriarch, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Byzantine Church. In 1352 the Servian Church was definitely separated from the Byzantine patriarchate. Henceforward twenty metropolitans and bishops were subordinate to the Servian patriarch. Servia was now at the zenith of her power. As Dusan was related to the rulers of Bessarabia and Bulgaria, he was able to form a confederation of these three kingdoms directed against Hungary and Byzantium.

The reign of Dusan was the golden age of Servia, chiefly for the reason that he provided the country with better administration and a better judicial system, and did his best to advance the civilisation and prosperity of the people. The code—sakonik or zakonik—which he left behind him, a



An episode in the life of Stefan Dusan, who is seen denouncing a traitor. Dusan succeeded to the throne of Serbia in 1331, and his name is eminent among the national heroes of his country. He is remembered especially for his successful campaigns against the Greeks, and for the code of laws which he issued in 1349 just seven years before his death.



The battlefield of Kossovo, or the "Field of the Blackbirds," is one of unhappy memory to the Servian people, as twice in their history it was the scene of their defeat. Here Sultan Murad I. destroyed the Servian Empire when he inflicted, in 1389, a crushing defeat on King Lazar, who was killed on the battlefield. This famous fight decided not only the fate of Serbia, but that of the races of the Balkan Peninsula. The above picture, by a Servian artist, commemorates the second defeat, in October, 1448, when, on the same scene, Sultan Murad II. gained a great victory over John Hunyadi. The remnants of the Servian army and fugitives are seen retreating from the fatal field.

TWO FAMOUS EPISODES IN THE HISTORY OF SERVIA

legal monument of the greatest importance, is a permanent testimony to the fame of Dusan. His conventions with Byzantium, Ragusa, and Venice proved that he also cared for the commercial prosperity of his people. The art of mining, which had been introduced under Nemanja, became so widely extended under Dusan that there

Stefan Dusan were five gold and five silver
Dies on mines in operation. These
the March were worked chiefly by Saxons, whom Prince Vladimir is said to have first brought into the country. Almost the only political mistake that can be urged against Dusan is the fact that he did not use his power to secure the possession of Bosnia, which was inhabited by a purely Servian population. As the whole of Bosnia was never entirely united with Servia, a spirit of individualism flourished in that country, which resulted, shortly after Dusan's death, in the foundation of the Bosnian kingdom under the Ban Tvrtko. Dusan's main object was the conquest of Byzantium, and chroniclers tell us of thirteen campaigns undertaken for this purpose. In 1355, when he was marching against the imperial city, he suddenly died. Had his son Stefan Uros IV. inherited his father's capacity together with his empire he would have been able to consolidate the great Servian state. Uros, however, was a weak, benevolent, and pious ruler, nicknamed by the nation "Nejaki"—that is to say, a man of no account. A revolt soon broke out. Even the first councillor of the tsar, the capable Vukasin, whom Dusan had placed at his son's side, stretched out his hand for the crown, and Uros was murdered in 1367. With him became extinct the main branch of the Nemanja dynasty, which had ruled over Servia for nearly 200 years.

In the civil war which then ensued the Servian nobility raised Lazar Grbljanovic, a brave and truthful man, to the throne. The new ruler, however, assumed the simple title of Knes or Prince.

The Turks Meanwhile the political situa-
in tion in the Balkans had under-
Europe gone a great change. The provinces formerly conquered by Dusan had revolted. Servia herself was too small and too undeveloped to become the nucleus of a great empire, and at the same time the administration of the country was in many respects deficient.

At this juncture a great danger threatened from abroad. For a long time the

Bulgarians and Serbs had been attacking the Byzantine Empire, hoping to aggrandise themselves at her expense, without suspecting that they were attempting to sever the branch by which they themselves were supported. The Turks in Asia began their advance upon the Byzantine Empire, and no force could check them. In the fourteenth century their military fame was so firmly established that the Byzantine emperors called in their assistance against the Bulgarians and Serbs. Soon, however, it became apparent that the most serious danger threatened all these peoples from the side of the Ottomans. In the year 1361 Murad I. occupied Adrianople and made that city his capital; Thracia became a Turkish province. The Byzantines were powerless to meet the danger. Immediately afterwards, in 1366, the Bulgarian Tsar, Sisman, became a Turkish vassal; his sister Thamar entered the harem of Murad. In the year 1371 the Servian usurper, Vukasin, marched against the Turks, but was defeated in the night of September 25th and 26th, and slain, together with his brother Johannes Ugljesa. The fatal field was known as Ssirb-

Famous Fight sündighi—that is, the
That Settled Servian death. Servia, how-
Servia's Fate ever, was not yet subdued.

It was not until 1386 that Lazar was forced to become a Turkish vassal, and the Turkish danger then lay heavily upon all men's minds. To save the honour of his nation, Lazar prepared for battle, made an alliance with Bulgaria, Albania, and Bosnia, and defeated the Turkish governor at Plocnik at the time when Murad was occupied in Asia. Murad, in anger, spent a whole year in preparation, both in Asia and Europe, and marched against Servia through Philippopolis in 1389. On the feast-day of St. Veit (June 15th) was fought the battle of Kossovo, or Amsel, the famous fight which decided not only the fate of Servia but that of the races of the Balkan Peninsula, and, indeed, of South-east Europe as a whole. The Servian army was supported by the Croatian Ban, Ivan Horvat, by the Bosnians under their Voivode Vladko Hranic, by auxiliary troops of the Roumanian and Bulgarian tribes, and by Albanians. In the dawn the Emir Murad was murdered in his tent, according to Servian tradition, by Milos Obilic, who thus hoped to turn from himself the suspicion of treachery, and was cruelly murdered in consequence. The supreme command

THE SERVIAN ERA OF INDEPENDENCE

was forthwith assumed by Bajazet I., the son of Murad. The Servians were utterly beaten; Lazar himself was captured, and was beheaded with many others beside the corpse of Murad. Serbia's future as a nation was destroyed upon that day.

Many songs and legends deplore the battle of Kossovo. It was not the superior force of the Ottomans, so the story goes, that brought about that fearful overthrow, but the treachery of a Servian leader, the godless Vuk Brankovic. In the Ottoman army was also fighting the Servian despot, or "King's Son," Marko (the son of Vukasin) of Priljep—a man of giant strength. These facts were the causes of the bitter defeat, and the Serbs fought like heroes. Even at the present day these magnificent epics form one of the chief beauties both of Slav literature and of the literature of the world; they have been admired even by Grimm and Goethe. The old, the blind, and the beggar sing at the present day in the market-place and on the roads the story of the famous old heroic legends, to the accompaniment of the *gusle*, and receive rich rewards from the people, who find in these songs a recompense and a

The Lost Glory of Servia consolation for the loss of their past glory. As the Tartars trampled upon the necks of the Russians, so also did the Turks upon the Southern Slavs. For centuries the Slav races have had to endure unspeakable barbarity at the hands of the Ottomans. Their development was arrested, and they were forced to lag behind in the march of civilisation, while at the same time they became a bulwark to the peoples of Western Europe. For this reason it is unjust to taunt them with their half-civilised condition; yet the injustice has been too often committed.

Bajazet, who was still occupied in Asia, placed Stefan, the son of Lazar, as despot on the Servian throne. Stefan was forced to pay tribute and to join in the Turkish campaigns in person at the head of his army; at Angora, in 1402, Timur himself marvelled at the bravery of the Serbs. The nation never lost the hope of recovering its old independence. Stefan turned to Hungary for support and became a Hungarian vassal, following the example of other Danube states who looked to Hungary or to Poland for help. Upon his death, in 1427, he was succeeded by George Brankovic, a son of that Brankovic to whose treachery

the defeat of 1389 was ascribed. He made his residence in Semendria on the Danube. Meanwhile all the states of the Balkans had been forced to bow beneath the Turkish yoke after suffering bloody defeats. Bulgaria fell in 1393. Then Zartum, Widdin, and Moldavia; in 1455 Byzantium itself was conquered.

The Doom of Servia Brankovic died on December 24th, 1457, and was succeeded by his feeble son, Lazar, who died suddenly at the end of January, 1458. In 1459 Mohammed II. took over Servia as a Turkish province and divided it into pashaliks. Many of the most distinguished families were exterminated, and two hundred thousand human beings were carried into slavery. Thus the Servian state disappeared from the map of Europe. As once before, after their immigration, so also now, the Serbs were ruled from Constantinople, and it was on the Bosphorus that the fate of the Balkan territories was decided. The wave of Turkish conquest continued to spread onward. Hungary and Poland were now forced to take up arms against it, until the turn of Austria arrived. To these states the Balkan peoples without exception now turned for help. Apart from Dalmatia on the north, which was inhabited by Croats, alternately under Venetian and Hungarian supremacy, the Turks subjugated the whole of the Balkan Peninsula, and ruthlessly oppressive was their rule. As, however, they were concerned only to drain the financial resources of the peoples they conquered, and troubled themselves little about questions of religion or nationality, it was possible for the Balkan Slavs to retain their national characteristics until the hour of their liberation.

The former birthplace of the Nemanjids, Zeta, had a happier fate. This mountainous district, which took its name from the river Ceta or Cetina, once formed part of the Roman province of Dalmatia. **Zeta's Happier Fate** The Emperor Diocletian had formed a special province of *Prævalis* in Southern Dalmatia, with Dioclea as its centre, from which town the whole province became known as *Dioclitia* or *Dioclea*. However, in the period of the Slav Serbs it was known as Zeta, and was regarded as the original land and hereditary property of the Nemanjids. St. Sava founded a bishopric and built the monastery of St. Michael at Cattaro. Every successor

to the throne first undertook the administration of Zeta. When, however, Dusan made his son Uros king and entrusted him with the administration of Servia proper, another governor had to be found for Zeta, and he was taken from the house of Bals. After the death of Dusan the house of the Balsics

When Montenegro Took its Name consequently ruled in Zeta (1360-1421) and became involved in struggles with the distinguished family of the Cernojevic or Jurasevic in the Upper Zeta. At the outset of the fifteenth century the Venetians began to form settlements here, until eventually this Servian coast land fell into the hands of Venice, notwithstanding repeated struggles on the part of Servia. The family of Cernojevic, which had joined the side of Venice, now became supreme about 1455; Ivan Cernojevic became a vassal of Venice and received a yearly subsidy. He resided in Zabljak and founded the monastery of Cetinje in 1478 or 1485. His son George resided in Rjeka and Obod; under him in Obod the first ecclesiastical Slav books were printed between 1493 and 1495. It is at that time (first in 1435) that this country takes the name of Crnagora or Montenegro.

After the fall of the family of Cernojevic in 1528, or really as early as 1516, the country was ruled for centuries by the bishops, or Vladiks, of Cetinje. The bishop and head of the monastery of Cetinje was at the same time the lord of the country.

It is not correct to say that the Turks never ruled over Montenegro and that the people were able to maintain their freedom by heroic struggles; the fact is that the Ottoman supremacy in this mountainous district was never more than nominal,

Provinces Revolt From the Servian Empire chiefly from the fact that they could not extract much gain from the poor inhabitants. But

Montenegro was subject to the Shandshak of Skodra, and was obliged to send a yearly tribute thither, a fact which we learn from the Italian description of Mariano Bolizza of the year 1511. At that time Montenegro included ten settlements and 8,027 men capable of bearing arms.

After the death of Dusan one province after another—first Thessaly and Epirus, and then Macedonia and Albania—revolted from the Servian Empire. Even Servian tribes, who had willingly or unwillingly gathered round the throne of the Nemanjids until 1355, now followed their individual desires. This is especially true of their relations, the Bosnians, whose country had never been entirely subject to Servia. In former times Bosnia, like Hungary and Ragusa, had been subject to the Roman archbishopric of Spalatro; later, Bosnian rulers had expressly declared themselves Serbs and descendants of the Nemanjids. None the less they went their own way. Their first prince, or ban, of any reputation was Kulin (1180-1204). Naturally Hungary and Servia were rivals for the possession of Bosnia, which availed itself of these circumstances to maintain its independence. It is only on one occasion, however, that this little district secured a greater reputation; this was when favourable political circumstances allowed the Ban

Bosnia's Independent Development Tvrtko, who regarded himself as a descendant of the Nemanjids, although his family belonged to the race of Kotromanovic, to secure the throne in 1376, since which date Bosnia has been a kingdom. This separation resulted in the fact that Bosnian civilisation developed upon somewhat different lines from Servian—a fact apparent not only in the adoption of Roman ecclesiastical customs, but also in literature and even in writing. Under King Tvrtko the doctrine of the Bogumiles, transplanted from Bulgaria, extended so rapidly that it became the established religion. Thus Bosnia in this respect also displayed an individualism of its own.

The final consequence was that under the Turkish supremacy the nobles, who were accustomed to religious indifferentism, went over in a body to Mohammedanism, in order to secure their class privileges. The possession of the Balkan Peninsula was secured to the Ottomans in 1453 in consequence of the overthrow of Constantinople, but it was not until 1463 that Bosnia was incorporated with the Turkish state; many citadels of the kind numerous in Bosnia held out even till 1526.





UNDER THE HEEL OF THE TURK THREE CENTURIES OF MISERY AND DESPAIR AND THE LIBERATION OF THE SOUTHERN SLAVS

UNDER the Turkish supremacy the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula entered upon a period of death and national sorrow; only the vaguest recollection of a better past endured. Immediately after the conquest of a province the Ottoman administration was introduced, the country was divided into provinces, or *pashaliks*, and these into districts, or *nahias*. The head of a pashalik was a pasha or vizir entitled to an ensign of three horse-tails, while the head of a nahia was called the kadi. There were pashaliks of Servia, Bosnia, Roumelia, Scutari, Widdin, etc., and the distribution of the provinces was often changed. The duties of the Turkish officials were confined to organising or maintaining military service, to levying the taxes, and to some administration of justice.

Side by side with the Turkish officials the institution of the spahis was of great importance. Upon Ottoman principles the whole country was the property of the sultan; he divided the conquered land among individuals, who received it either as hereditary property (*zian*) or for life tenure (*timir*), and were under the obligation of giving military service in return; these individuals were known as spahis, or horsemen. Thus, for example, the pashalik of Servia was divided among about 900 spahis, who were masters both of the soil and of its inhabitants. Many

Christian Nobles Turn Moslems Christian noble families became hereditary spahis by accepting Mohammedanism; about the middle of the seventeenth century there were in Roumelia, not including Bosnia, 1,294 spahis, who had formerly been Christian Bulgarians, Serbs, Albanians, or Greeks.

Side by side with the state administration there also existed a kind of provincial administration, which was left in the hands of the people. Every village was adminis-

tered by its judge and overseer (*scoski-knes* and *kmet*), who settled the affairs of the village and explained the traditional principles of justice, though only to those who had need of them and submitted to their decisions. They had no power to enforce execution, and dissatisfied litigants applied to the Turkish authorities. A dis-

System of Local Government trict was also governed by the *obor knes* (upper knes), originally appointed by the sultan. Local administration went no further than this. For the most part the people submitted to the decisions of their own judges and rarely appealed to the Ottoman authorities; at the same time the kneses and upper kneses, acting as intermediaries between the populace and the Turkish authorities, protected the multitude. At a later period, however, the upper kneses became hereditary, and enjoyed such high prestige that even the Turks were forced to respect them.

Apart from this the Servian Church remained independent under the patriarch of Ipek. It should be observed that the higher clergy at that time were chiefly of Greek origin, and the patriarch of Constantinople hoped to bring the Slavs over to the Greek Church by their means. In the seventeenth century the independence of the Servian patriarchate was abolished, and the Church was placed under the patriarchate of Constantinople, as it had been before 1346. In the year 1766 the patriarchate was abolished altogether, as also was the Bulgarian patriarchate of Ohrida in 1767; bishops were now sent out from Stamboul. Only the lower clergy remained purely national and shared the sufferings of the people.

Such were the powers which determined the existence of the subjugated people. The life of the rayahs, as subjugated peoples were called, was one without law or rights, and in every respect miserable.

Particularly oppressive was the weight of taxation. First of all came the sultan's or the state tax. Next the male population were obliged to pay a poll tax of three piastres and two paras to the state chest for every person between the age of seven and sixty; this was known as the haraj. Even the priests in monasteries were not exempt from this tax. Three times a year the Turkish officials appeared in the villages, pitched their tents, and levied the haraj. The better to control the tax, a register of boys and men was kept. Besides this, married men paid an undefined tax, known as pores, twice every year, on St. George's Day and St. Demeter's day, to cover the cost of administration.

Turkish Tax-gatherers at Work

The kneses held a meeting in the central town of the nahia and estimated the yearly expenses of administration, which they then distributed among the individual inhabitants; naturally the estimate varied from year to year. Besides this the imperial exchequer collected taxes from the merchants for their shops and also from the tobacco planters; then there were customs duties, duties upon fishing, upon river traffic, etc. Besides the state taxes the rayahs had also to satisfy their territorial masters, the spahis. Every married man paid one piastre for poll tax, two piastres married tax, two piastres grazing tax (*kolar*) for the use of pasturage, one piastre meal tax per head, two piastres kettle tax for every brandy still, from four to ten paras acorn tax for every herd of swine, and finally a tenth of a field or garden produce; they were also liable to forced labour. Even the secular clergy were obliged to pay these taxes.

Naturally, the population were also obliged to provide for the support of their kneses, upper kneses and clergy. In Servia, for instance, a bishop extracted twelve piastres from every house, and on a journey through his diocese an additional five piastres as well as his maintenance; as they were obliged to buy their office at Constantinople, they were forced to recoup themselves in this way. The priests received tithes of agricultural produce, and occasionally payments for church services.

More oppressive even than these various taxes was the administration of justice. In every nahia a kadi was the judge, who was also assisted by a musselim, as the

executor of the judicial power. Above the kadi stood the chief judge, or mollah, of the whole province. All these officials supported themselves entirely upon court fees and fines. As they were able to obtain office only by bribery, the manner in which they exercised their powers may easily be imagined. Turkish law knew no other punishment than the monetary fine, except in the case of political misdeeds; even for murder the punishment was only the price of blood. Usually the officials pursued their own interests alone, and innocent people often suffered. The musselims were especially dreaded, as they continually came into contact with the people, were acquainted with their circumstances, and consequently could easily satisfy their desires or their vengeance upon any object. Beyond all this, the evidence of a Christian was not admitted by the courts, and the Ottoman administration of justice thus became a system of torture which could be escaped only by flight.

A further torment for the Christian rayah was the presence of the regular Turkish foot soldiers, the Janissaries; these forces were originally in possession of no landed property and only obtained pay. When, however, they were sent out from Constantinople, distributed among the provinces, and secured the imperial power for themselves, they were anxious to become landowners, like the spahis, and seized with the strong hand all that pleased them. The poor rayahs had no protection against their greed; they might console themselves with the words of Virgil, "Not for yourselves, ye birds, did ye build your nests; not for yourselves, ye sheep, did ye wear your wool; not for yourselves, ye bees, did ye gather honey; not for yourselves, ye oxen, did ye draw the plough."

Especially cruel was the levy of youths, which took place every five years, to supply men for the Janissaries, who then became Mchammedans. Towns only were able to secure immunity by the payment of large sums.

Far more humiliating and intolerable was the treatment of the rayah at the hands of the Mohammedans. It was at this point that the differences between conquerors and conquered first became plainly obvious. It was a difference expressed in outward form. The clothing

THREE CENTURIES OF TURKISH OPPRESSION

of the rayahs was simple. They were not allowed to wear the kaftan or gold or silver embroidery on their clothes. They were not to inhabit beautiful houses or to keep good horses. They were forbidden to wear swords. In the town the rayah might go only on foot. If a Christian appeared before Turks, he must hide his pistols; if he met them on the road, he must alight from his horse, and stand before them if they sat. Apart from this the Turk might call any Christian from the street and force him to bring water, look after his horse, or perform any other duty. Christian women were handed over to Mohammedans without reserve if they found favour in their eyes; at a marriage the bride was concealed in a cellar with her head veiled in cloths.

The result was that the Christians fled into the inaccessible mountains and forests, and from there defended themselves against their oppressors. Their numbers steadily increased. In the Slav provinces they were known as hayduks, and in Greece as klephts. They were robbers who also robbed the Christians upon occasion. But the spirit of freedom remained alive among their numbers, and they were respected by the population as avengers of the people and champions of freedom, were protected from the pursuing Turks, and were celebrated in song as heroes. As the Christians were forbidden to bear arms, the robber Christians became the only people able to defend themselves.

In their misery the people found consolation in their kneses and upper kneses, in the spahis, who generally treated them mildly, and particularly in the Church. It was the monks who were popular, rather than the secular clergy. The monasteries were at that time the centres of national life. They enjoyed privileges from the state, and were less dependent upon the Ottoman authorities. The monks alone were allowed to hear confessions and to celebrate the Communion. They were the only educated class, and preserved the remnants of Slav literature. The people swarmed to the monasteries from the remotest districts, and on dedication festivals lively scenes took place. Merchants then sold their wares; lambs and pigs were roasted; and to the sound of the shepherd's pipe or bagpipe the Servian youths danced their national dance, the

kolo, which was also known in Bulgaria, and the old men sang songs of the national heroes.

The Turkish danger and the menace of a common enemy formed a point of union which united the shattered fragments of the Servian-Croatian races, not only in political, but also in literary and civilised life. The Croatians, at least, had the possibility of satisfying their feelings of revenge in battle. The Serbs, who were forbidden even to wear arms, were obliged to endure their cruel fate in silent submission. At the period when Croatia began to surround herself with frontier defences, and thereby became more capable of resistance, Turkey was at the height of her power, and the Servian race could see no gleam of hope for a better future. Hence many of them turned their backs upon their native land and fled across the frontier to the more fortunate Croatia, that they might be able, at least from that point, to wage war against their oppressors.

However, in the seventeenth century, when the political development of the Ottoman state had reached its fulness, it became manifest that its fundamental principles were suited only to military and political life, and not for social life or the advancement of culture, and that, in consequence, the Turk was unprogressive and wholly incompetent to rule over other nations. The Turkish state was founded upon theocratic principles; the Koran formed at once its Bible and its legal code. If the subjugated peoples professed some other religion they could never be full citizens of the Ottoman Empire, but would be forced to remain in a position of subjection. Meanwhile, in Western Europe, civil law, as opposed to canon law, permitted members of other communions to become full citizens, so that subject races could more easily maintain their faith and become incorporated. In Turkey this was impossible. The Mohammedan alone was in possession of rights: the Christian rayah had no rights; his only guarantee for a better future was the downfall of the existing system. We can, then, well understand that the Christian populations were ever waiting for the moment when they would be able to shake off the oppressive yoke of Turkey. If the burden became intolerable the nation emigrated

in a body. The strength of religious fanaticism among the Turks, both in past and present times, may be judged from the fact that religion rules the whole social and political life and culture of Turkey even at the present day.

In point of numbers the Slavs were superior to the Turks. The empire swarmed with Mohammedans of Slav origin, serving in the army as well as in the official bodies. According to the testimony of Paolo Giovio in 1531 and other competent authorities, almost the whole of the Janissary troops spoke Slav. Numerous Slavs rose to the position of vizir and grand vizir. Under Mohammed Sokolovic half the vizirs were Slavs in the sixteenth century. Several sultans were fully acquainted with the Slav language, and several chancellors issued Slav documents in Cyrillic writing. The Turkish Empire was, as is remarked by the Servian historian, on the road to becoming a Mohammedan-Slav empire.

These facts, however, did not improve the life of the Christian rayahs. For almost three centuries these races had groaned under the Turkish yoke. Help was to be expected only from without. The first gleam appeared between 1684 and 1686, when Austria, under Charles of Lorraine repeatedly defeated the Turkish armies and occupied several provinces. At that time the court of Vienna conceived a great plan of playing off the Balkan peoples against the Porte, and entered into relations with the patriarch of Ipek, Arsen Cernojevic, and with George Brankovic, who professed to descend from the old Servian royal family. Brankovic went to Russia with his brother in 1688 to collect money for the building of the Servian metropolitan church and to secure Russia's help for the war against the Porte; at the court of Vienna he was made viscount and then count. The

The War of Liberation Austrian commander-in-chief, Ludwig Wilhelm, Margrave of Baden, issued an appeal to the Slavs of Bosnia, Albania, and Herzegovina, to join him in war against the Turks.


The Eastern Slavs had already given their favour to Austria, when the Vienna court seized the person of George Brankovic, who had already appointed himself Despot of Illyria, Servia, Syrmia, Moesia, and Bosnia, and imprisoned

him first in Vienna, then in Eger, where he died in 1711. This action naturally disturbed the relations between Servia and Austria. However, the war of liberation was continued. Among the Eastern Slavs there was an old legend that some day they would be freed from the Turkish yoke by a hero who would come riding upon a camel, accompanied with foreign animals. Utilising this legend, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, the general of the Margrave of Baden, appeared among the Servian nations with camels, asses and parrots, and called them to arms. In 1690 the Emperor Leopold I. again proclaimed that he would guarantee religious and political freedom "to all the Slav peoples of the whole of Albania, Servia, Illyria, Mysia, Bulgaria, Silistria, Macedonia, and Rascia," and again called them to arms against the Turks.

In the same year 36,000 Servian and Albanian families migrated from Servia under the leadership of the patriarch Arsen Cernojevic. From Belgrade they sent the bishop of Janopol, Jesaias Diakovic, to the court of Vienna as the plenipotentiary of the "Community of Greek Raizes." The emperor issued the desired guarantees for the whole people and for the three Brankovics in a special charter of liberties. Cernojevic received a guarantee of his position of metropolitan "for the whole of Greece, Rascia, Bulgaria, Dalmatia, Bosnia, Janopol, Herzegovina, and over all the Serbs in Hungary and Croatia."

The Serbs then passed over the Save and settled chiefly in Slavonia, Syrmia, and in some towns of Hungary; Karlstadt was chosen as the seat of the Servian patriarch. The privileges of these immigrants were often enough disputed by the Hungarian municipal, ecclesiastical, and political authorities, but were invariably confirmed by the imperial court, which took the Serbs under its protection. Supreme successes against the Turks were secured when Prince Eugene of Savoy took the lead of the Austrian troops in July, 1697. The great victory of Zenta was the first indication of the fall of Turkish supremacy in Europe; henceforward the little state of Montenegro fought successfully against the Ottomans.

However, the first decisive effort was the Russo-Turkish war. Western Europe



A STREET DANCE IN SERBIA IN THE MIDDLE AGES

had long striven to induce Russia to take part in the struggle. Peter the Great was the first to take action in 1711, with that campaign which roused great hopes among the Balkan Slavs. At that date the first Russian ambassador, Colonel Miloradovic, a Herzegovinian by birth, of Neretva, brought to Cetinje a letter from Peter the Great, calling upon the Montenegrins to take up arms; he met with an enthusiastic reception. Thereupon Danilo Petrovic Njegos, the metropolitan and ruler of Montenegro (1697-1735), made a journey to Russia in 1715, and received rich presents and promises of future support.

Henceforward the Southern Slavs based their hopes rather upon their compatriots and co-religionists in Russia than upon Austria. However, the campaign of 1711 was a failure; and it was not until many years afterwards that Russia undertook a second advance, under Catharine II. In 1774 Russia secured a protectorate over the Danube principalities and over all the Christians of the Greek Church. Catharine again turned her attention to the warlike state of Montenegro and sent General George Dolgoruki to Cetinje in 1769; and from 1788 to 1791 the Russian lieutenant-colonel Count Ivelic and the Austrian

THREE CENTURIES OF TURKISH OPPRESSION

major Vukasovic were working in Montenegro with similar objects.

In the seventeenth century, when it became more obvious that the Turk was not invincible, and when enthusiasm had been roused by the hope of liberation, the Southern Slavs became more convinced than before of a relationship nearer than that of fate and political alliance; the feeling of blood relationship grew strong in them, and they began to call themselves brothers and members of a Slav race. The feeling of mutual connection extended not merely to the Southern Slavs, but spread over the whole Slav world. They appealed to their Russian kinsmen for help, and authors wrote enthusiastically of a great Slav family. Austria gave some stimulus to the movement by repeatedly summoning all the Balkan Slavs to common action against the Turks.

In the history of the Austrian Slav of that period there gradually arises from the background the outline of a new southern Slav Empire which was intended to embrace all the Southern Slav races. A name was invented for it, that of Illyria. The name was chosen to secure connection with past history. Illyricum had formerly been a Roman province, including Macedonia and Greece, with Crete, Dardania, and Dacia; in 476 it was assigned to the East Roman Empire. At that moment the phrase "the Illyrian nation" meant nothing more than the peoples professing the faith of the Greek Church, and as

most of the Serbs were members of this, they also entitled themselves the "Raizes, or Illyrian nation." Now the name of Illyria was extended to include the Croatians and Slavonians. It was specially used in this sense by the Roman Church, which had not forgotten the old diocese of Illyria, and used the term to denote the Slavs in the west of the Balkan Peninsula. From this ecclesiastical use the connotation of the name was extended. In Hungary, where fugitive Serbs made common cause with the Croatians, the Illyrian question was a constant subject of discussion.

Maria Theresa protected the Croatians and Serbs from the aggressions of the Magyars, and created for the special protection of the Serbs a new administrative organ, the "Illyrian Delegation," in 1746. The court of Vienna also regarded the Hungarian Serbs as a valuable counterpoise to the Magyars. Under the Emperor Leopold II. the Illyrian national congress was held in Temesvar in 1790; demands were here issued for the separation of the Servian nation in the banat and in the backska (voievodina), for an Illyrian chancery, for the parliamentary equality of the Servian bishops with the ecclesiastical princes of Herzegovina, and for a governor, who was to be one of the emperor's sons. How the conception of Illyria first received official extension in the age of Napoleon belongs to another period and a later volume. VLADIMIR MILKOWICZ



TYPICAL TURKISH GENTLEMAN OF THE MERCHANT CLASS

GREAT DATES IN THE HISTORY OF SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE: A.D. 500 TO 1792

A.D.		A.D.	
500	Anastasius emperor	1204	Latin empire of Byzantium till 1261
518	Justin emperor	1218	John Asen II. Tsar of Bulgaria
527	Justinian emperor	1222	Golden Bull of Hungary
529	The Justinian code issued	1241	Mongols devastate Hungary, but retire
533	Overthrow of the Vandals by Belisarius	1261	Fall of Latin empire of Byzantium; Greek dynasty restored under Michael Palæologus; Mongol invasion of Hungary repelled by Bela IV.
552	Narses defeats the Goths in Italy		
558	Repulse of the Huns and Avars	1274	League between Ladislaus of Hungary and Rudolf of Habsburg
565	Justin II. emperor	1288	Beginning of Ottoman power
582	Maurice emperor	1301	End of Arpad dynasty in Hungary. Othman defeats Byzantines at Nicomedia
602	Phocas emperor	1303	Charles Robert of Anjou elected king of Hungary
610	Heraclius emperor	1323	Sismanid dynasty in Bulgaria till 1393
613	Advance of Persians under Khosru	1330	Predominance of Serbia in the Balkans
622	Heraclius checks the Persian advance. The Hegira: date-year of Islam	1342	Lewis the Great king of Hungary
626	Defeat of Avars before Constantinople	1345	Servian conquests under Stefan Dusan
634	Advance of the Saracen power	1347	John Cantacuzenos joint emperor
640	Establishment of Slavs in Bosnia	1356	Turks cross the Hellespont
660	Founding of the Bulgarian kingdom	1361	Turks occupy Adrianople
673	Saracens besiege Constantinople	1363	Turks defeat Magyars and Slavs at Marizza
712	Advance of Bulgarians	1370	Lewis of Hungary elected king of Poland
717	Leo III. the Isaurian emperor	1386	Sigismund king of Hungary
725	Beginning of Iconoclastic movement	1389	Turkish victory at Kossova; subjugation of Serbia and Bulgaria
727	Defeat of Saracens at Nicæa	1396	Turkish victory at Nicopolis
739	Defeat of Saracens at Acroinon	1402	Overthrow of Bajazet by Tamerlane
750	Fall of Omayyad caliphate	1411	Sigismund of Hungary becomes German emperor [med I.]
773	Bulgarians checked	1413	Recovery of Ottoman power under Moham-
780	Constantine VI. emperor; Irene regent	1442	Victories of Hunyadi over Turks
787	Second Council of Nicæa restores image-worship	1444	Turks defeat Hungarians at Varna
797	Irene empress [worship]	1448	Turks defeat Hunyadi at Kossova
802	Fall of Irene ends Isaurian dynasty; Nicephorus emperor	1449	Scanderbeg heads Albanian revolt [empire]
803	Treaty with Charlemagne [phorus emperor]	1453	Capture of Constantinople; end of Byzantine
813	Leo V. defeats Bulgarians	1456	Hunyadi defends Belgrade against Turks
820	Michael the Stammerer emperor	1458	Matthias Corvinus king of Hungary
852	Boris king of Bulgaria	1461	Turks acknowledge Scanderbeg's independence
863	Christian mission of Constantine and Methodius among the Slavs [Churches]	1467	Death of Scanderbeg
866	Final breach between Greek and Roman	1477	Turks subjugate Albania
867	Basil I. emperor; Macedonian dynasty begins	1479	Turks defeated by Matthias Corvinus [tria]
869	Council of Constantinople	1491	Invasion of Hungary by Maximilian of Aus-
886	Leo VI. emperor	1517	Conquest of Mamelukes by Sultan Selim
893	Simeon king of Bulgarians	1521	Suleiman the Magnificent takes Belgrade
912	Constantine Porphyrogenetos emperor	1526	Victory of Suleiman at Mohacz; Ferdinand of Austria becomes king of Hungary
917	Defeat of imperial army by Simeon of Bulgaria, who takes the title of Tsar	1534	Turkish fleets commanded by Barbarossa
926	Timislav king of Croatia	1536	Alliance of Turks and French
941	Defeat of Russian fleet by Byzantines	1545	Ferdinand of Austria pays tribute to Turks
963	Nicephorus Phocas emperor	1547	Treaty between Suleiman and Charles V.
969	John Tzimisce emperor	1571	Overthrow of Turkish fleet at Lepanto
971	Overthrow of Bulgaria by Tzimisce	1593	War between Austria and Turkey
994	Conversion of Magyars by Adelbert	1606	Peace of Zsitvatorok [Vizirs]
997	Saint Stefan duke of Hungarians	1656	Revival of Ottoman power under the Kuprili
1000	Saint Stefan king of Hungary	1664	Austro-Turkish war; Turks defeated at St. Gothard [Khoczin]
1018	Subjugation of Bulgaria by Basil II.	1673	John Sobieski of Poland defeats Turks at
1040	Servia established as independent	1675	Sobieski defeats Turks at Lemberg
1044	Peter of Hungary does homage to German emperor	1683	Sobieski defeats Turks before Vienna
1052	Independence of Hungary recognised	1687	Defeat of Turks at Mohacz
1053	Suppression of Roman Churches in the East	1697	Defeat of Turks by Prince Eugene at Zenta
1056	Macedonian dynasty ends with Theodora	1699	Peace of Carlowitz
1071	Normans expel Byzantine rule from Italy	1711	Peter the Great, foiled by the Turks, has to accept the treaty of Pruth
1076	Capture of Jerusalem by Seljuk Turks	1716	Final repulse of Turks by Eugene at Peterwardein
1077	Saint Ladislaus king of Hungary	1737	Austro-Russian war with Turkey
1081	Alexius Comnenus emperor	1738	Peace of Belgrade
1087	Invasion of empire by Pechenegs	1741	Hungary acclaims Maria Theresa
1090	Annexation of Croatia by Hungary	1774	Treaty of Kutchuk Kainardji between Turkey and Russia
1096	First Crusade	1783	Russia annexes Crimea
1102	Coloman extends Hungarian kingdom	1788	Austro-Russian war with Turkey
1132	Bela II. king of Hungary	1791	Peace of Sistova
1141	Manuel I. emperor	1792	Treaty of Jassy
1144	Fall of Edessa; cause of Second Crusade		
1151	Manuel invades Hungary		
1173	Bela III. king of Hungary		
1185	Isaac Angelus emperor		
1187	Capture of Jerusalem by Saladin		
1190	Nemanja king of Servia		
1197	Asenid dynasty established in Bulgaria		
1203	Fourth Crusade; Crusaders take Byzantium		



THE STORY OF THE GIPSIES

HABITS & CUSTOMS OF A WANDERING PEOPLE

IT remains to give some account of one more people, which, coming from the East, has never found rest for the sole of its foot, but has dispersed itself over Europe, and has even crossed the ocean, and yet has retained its distinctive racial character. For more than 500 years the Gipsy people have traversed East and Central Europe, wandering restlessly from place to place. In general they live at the present day

Restless Wanderers in Europe

among nations which have long ago been definitely settled and become organised, themselves still following their peculiar nomadic manners and customs under individual tribal chiefs. Even at the date of their first appearance in Europe the gipsies were able to give no adequate account of their origin or of their first home. The names which they apply to themselves are not without importance from an historical and ethnographical point of view. They call themselves by the old Indian name of an unclean caste "rom" = man, "romni" = woman. Another self-bestowed title is "kalo" (black), the opposite term to which, "parno" (white), is applied to all non-gipsies. Finally, the gipsies also style themselves "manusch" (people), while foreigners are known as "gadsio" (strangers). Upon rare occasions, and generally only in the course of public debate, they address one another as "sinte" (comrades).

More numerous are the names applied to the gipsies by the peoples with whom they came in contact. The German word "Zigeuner" is probably derived from the Phrygian-Lycaonian sect of the "Athin-ganoi," mentioned at the outset of the

ninth century by such Byzantine writers as Theophanes. Another derivation is from "tsjengi"; that is, musicians, dancers, etc. A third connects it with the Cangar tribe in the Punjab. It is, however, certain that the Germans received the name from the Czechs, who took it from the Magyars; the latter got it from the Roumanians, who again borrowed it from the Bulgarians. The name "Zigeuner" became general only in Eastern Europe and Italy (zingari); other names were used by the West Europeans. The Modern Greek Tuphtes, the Spanish and Portuguese Gitano, the Flemish Egyptenær, the English gipsy, are all forms of the title Egyptian. On their arrival in Central Europe the gipsies announced themselves to be Egyptians, whence their name "pharao nepe" (Pharaoh's people), still in use among the Magyars. In the Low-German speaking countries the gipsies were originally known as Suyginer, Zigöner, or even "Hungarians," and afterwards as "Tätern" or Tartars; in France they were called Bohémiens, as they came from Bohemia with letters of protection from King Sigismund of Hungary and Bohemia. Since the time of the appearance of the gipsies in Europe, the flood of theories respecting their origin and descent has mounted high. After the interesting linguistic essay of Andrew Boorde in 1542, one of the earliest dissertations "de Cingaris" is to be found in the work of the Netherland Hellenist Bonaventura Vulcanius, "De literis et lingua Getarum" (Leyden, 1542); Job Ludolf also paid some

The Proteges of the Bohemian King

THE STORY OF THE GIPSIES

attention to their vocabulary in the commentary to his "Ethiopian History" published in 1691. The majority of scholars agree that the name of the sect of the Athinganer, the untouched, or those of another faith, has been transferred to the gipsies (cingani). Others looked for their origin in Zeugitana, or Carthage, a province formed under Diocletian and Constantine. Others, again, identified them with the Zygians, Canaanites, Saracens, Amorites and Jews, or regarded them as the descendants of Chus, the son of Cham (Genesis x. 6).

The Hungarian chronicler Pray made a nearer guess at the truth in considering their first home to have been the former Seljuk kingdom of Rum (Iconium), as the

In the little town of Fürstenau was a gravestone, erected on the vigil of St. Sebastian (19th January), 1445, to the deceased "noble lord Sir Panuel, duke of Egypt Minor and lord of the stag's horn in that country." The coat of arms upon the stone displayed a golden eagle crowned, and above the tilting helmet a crown with a stag. Another monument with a fantastic coat of arms existed in the neighbourhood of Backnang in Württemberg dated 1453, to the "noble count Peter of Kleinschild."

There is no doubt that the gipsies had leaders, and that those who live in tents have leaders at the present day; these leaders have a distinctive sign, such as an



AN ENCAMPMENT OF THE FIRST GIPSIES IN CENTRAL EUROPE
From an engraving by Jacques Callot in 1604, now in the Dresden Cabinet of Engravings.

gipsies call themselves Rom. On their first appearance many assumed that they were pilgrims from Egypt, who were performing a seven years' penitential pilgrimage, in expiation of the refusal of their ancestors to receive the infant Christ in Egypt when he was fleeing from Herod with his parents. These and similar legends are related at the present day by wandering gipsy tribes in Hungary and in the Balkan territories. Here we have an explanation of the tenacious adherence to the belief in their Egyptian origin. The gipsy leaders also contributed to the spread of this belief; after 1400 they styled themselves "kings," "dukes," or "counts of Egypt Minor," and appeared as rulers of distinction in every district.

Legends of Nomadic Tribes

embroidered cloak, cloth, or goblet. The several tribes of the nomadic gipsies are also social units in so far as they are under the government of one voivode. In practice they are nowhere tolerated in large hordes, and have consequently broken up into smaller independent communities or societies ("mahlija," from "mahlo" = friend), under individual chieftains, the "schaibidso." In important cases these leaders appeal to the decision of the voivode, who may be spending his time with one or another tribe. The schaibidso is elected by the tribe, and the voivode confirms his appointment by eating bread and salt with him in public; he then commands the mahlija in question to regard the schaibidso as his plenipotentiary. Among the nomadic gipsies the position of voivode is hereditary

at the present day; if a minor should inherit, the position is occupied until his majority by one of his nearest relations. The installation of a voivode is a very simple ceremony. The voivode recites a form of oath, and is lifted up by his tribesmen while the women throw crab-apple seeds upon him, to keep away evil

**The Home
of the
Gipsy Tongue**

spirits. The voivode among the nomadic gipsies at the present day occupies a position which is merely honourable; formerly every mahlija paid him a yearly tribute proportioned to the position and the number of its members.

Various investigators have been misled by confusing the "Romany" tongue with the "thieves' Latin" of one country or another. It was, however, long suspected, and has now been definitely proved, that the home of the gipsy language—and therefore of the gipsies—is in the north-west of India. It belongs to the same group as the Dardu languages spoken in Kafiristan, Dardistan, Kashmir, and Little Tibet.

The science of comparative philology has clearly proved the gipsies to be a branch of the Hindu nationality; it has also shown us by what route the gipsies left India, and in what countries their migrations have been interrupted for a longer or shorter period. The causes which drove the gipsies to migration, and the date at which their wanderings began, are shrouded for ever in obscurity. It is, however, tolerably certain that more than one migration took place. Possibly we have here the explanation of the fact that in many countries where they are now naturalised they are divided into two or more castes. Individual advances or disruptions may have taken place at an early date, while the first great movement or movements did not begin before the Christian era. The Persian and Armenian elements in the European dialects clearly

**In League
with
the Arabs**

show that the gipsies must have made their way first through Armenia and Persia, and have remained a considerable time in those countries. They entered Persia under the Sassanid dynasty, and were given the marshy districts on the Lower Euphrates as a settlement. They readily made common cause with the Arab conquerors; but after the death of the Caliph Mamun in 833 they left their settlements, and disturbed the country by

their plundering raids, until Ojeif ibn Ambassa was obliged to bring them to reason by force of arms.

The Armenian "Bosha"—that is, vagabonds—the gipsies of the Armenian faith (the Mohammedan gipsies of Asia Minor are known as "Chingene," or "Chinghiané"), who are chiefly to be found at Bujbat in the vilayet of Sivas, when not engaged in their favourite occupation of wandering, speak a language which possesses an unusually sparse vocabulary—about 600 words in all; no songs—but undoubtedly belongs to the Indian branch of the Aryan family of languages; their chief occupation is sieve-making. Neither in Turkish nor in Russian Armenia, whither part of them have migrated since 1828, do they bring their disputes before the state tribunals, but before the council of their elders, presided over by the Althopakal (expressly confirmed in office by the Porte; formerly called Jamadar); in Russian Armenia he is associated with an Ustadar or secular caste-chieftain. From Armenia members of the gipsy nationality may have migrated to North Africa through Syria, and thence, though

**Venetians
Tax the
Gipsies**

not before the nineteenth century, to the centre and north-west of South America, where, following the convenient waterways, they infest one republic and town after another; thus they visit Guayaquil in Ecuador every two or three years. Another and stronger division entered Europe through Phrygia and Lycaonia and across the Hellespont. Greece is to be regarded as the first European home of all the gipsies who are dispersed throughout Europe, including the Spanish. There is tolerable evidence for the presence of gipsies in Byzantium at the outset of the ninth century; and in Crete in the year 1322 we hear of them from the Franciscan Simon Simeonis.

About 1398 the Venetian governor of Nauplion, Ottaviano Burno, confirmed the privileges granted by his predecessors to John, chieftain of the Acingani. The Venetians allowed the gipsies to settle in the Peloponnese on payment of certain dues. Many ruins still known as Typhtracastron—that is, Egyptian or gipsy fortress—remain as evidence of their occupation. German travellers in the second half of the fifteenth century report the presence of these "Egyptian" settlers. In Corfu "Vageniti" were to be found before



THE BREAKING UP OF A GIPSY ENCAMPMENT
 From the painting by Sir John Gilbert, by permission of the Corporation of Manchester.

1346; about 1370-1373 there was a fully organised gipsy colony, the members of which are mentioned as being in the service of the barons, Theodoros Kavasilas, Nicolà di Donato of Altavilla, and Bernard de Saint-Maurice. About 1386 a "feudum Acinganorum" was founded from this colony, first conferred upon the Baron Gianuli di Abitabulo, then in 1540 upon the scholar Antonio Eparco, who carried on a correspondence with Melanchthon; in 1563 it passed into the hands of the Count Theodoro Trivoli.

In the first half of the fourteenth century those migrations in the Balkan Peninsula took place in the course of which the Albanians occupied Attica and the Peloponnese, while numerous Armenian families settled in Moldavia and many Roumanians migrated to the slopes of Mount Pindus; at that moment a large number of the gipsies began to advance into Wallachia. They must have been settled in the country by 1370, for in 1387 the Hospodar Mircea the Old confirmed a donation of forty Zalassi, or tent, gipsies

made by the last of his predecessors, Layko (Vlad I.), to the monastery of St. Maria in Tismana (Wallachia Minor) and to that of St. Antonius, "na Vodici" and others. When Wallachia afterwards became tributary to the Turks, the gipsies may have begun to migrate in large numbers to Transylvania and Hungary. Hence they spread over the whole of Europe. It was not until 1820-1830 that Alexander Ghika relaxed the serfdom of the gipsies in Wallachia, which was finally abolished on March 3rd, 1856.

In the year 1417 the first gipsies appeared in the Hansa towns on the North Sea and the Baltic. They produced commendatory letters from the Emperor Sigismund, and repeated the story of their Egyptian origin and their seven years' penitential pilgrimage, and thus gained the support both of Church and State as well as that of private individuals. In 1418 we find them also in Switzerland.

However, this friendly reception was soon followed by persecution, in accordance with the somewhat barbarous spirit of the

age. It was not so much the actual misdeeds or the annoying presence of the strangers as their unusual customs that attracted the attention of the authorities. It was also to the prejudice of this miserable and harmless race that they came from districts more or less in possession of the Turks. They were regarded as the

In the Service of Christianity's Enemies

advance guard or as the spies of the "hereditary enemies of Christendom." Thus, the recess of 1479 of the German imperial diet proclaimed, "with regard to those who are called gipsies and constantly traverse the land, seeing that we have evidence to show that the said gipsies are the spies and scouts of the enemy of Christianity, we command that they are not to be suffered to enter or to settle in the country, and every authority shall take due measures to prevent such settlement and at the next assembly shall bring forward such further measures as may seem advisable." In the following year the diet of Freiburg declared the gipsies outlaws—that is to say, the murderer of a gipsy went unpunished.

However, the gipsies were steadily reinforced by new arrivals from Hungary, and these measures produced little effect. In any case, it was found necessary to renew them in the recess of the diets of 1500, 1544, 1548, and 1577. On September 20th, 1701, the Emperor Leopold declared that on the reappearance of the gipsies "the most drastic measures would be taken against them." A worthy counterpart to this decree is the regulation of the Count of Reuss, published on July 13th, 1711, and made more stringent on December 12th, 1713, and May 9th, 1722, to the effect that "all gipsies found in the territory of Reuss were to be shot down on the spot."

Every conceivable crime was laid to the charge of the gipsies; among other

Unjust Gipsy Executions

accusations it was said that they exhumed dead bodies to satisfy their craving for human flesh. In consequence of a charge of this nature, forty-five gipsies were unjustly executed in 1782 in the county of Hont in North-west Hungary. The accusation is based upon a misunderstanding of their funeral customs, in which the strongest characteristic of gipsy religious sentiment, the feeling of fear, is vigorously emphasised. In a

lonely corner of the village churchyard or at the edge of some secluded wood the corpse is interred, and the spot is marked with a curious post, shaped like a wedge, the upper end of which is hardly visible above the surface of the ground, while the lower end almost touches the head of the corpse.

This custom is connected with an older use, now disappearing, in accordance with which the relatives took away the head of the corpse after a certain time, buried it elsewhere and drove the post deep into the earth in its place—solely for the purpose of hastening the process of putrefaction. Only after complete putrefaction of the body, according to gipsy belief, can the soul enter the "kingdom of the dead" where it then lives a life analogous to that of earth. Gipsies may have been surprised in the performance of this custom, and have been consequently accused of eating the corpse.

By degrees the gipsies advanced from Germany over the neighbouring parts of East and Northern Europe. They entered Poland and Lithuania in the reign of Vladislav II. Jagellon. In 1501 King Alexander I. granted a

The Last of the Gipsy "Kings"

charter to Vasil, the "woyt cyganski." The diet of 1557 ordered the expulsion of the strangers, and this decree was repeated in 1565, 1578, and 1618. The gipsies, however, found life in this country very tolerable. They were governed by a leader of their own, whose position was confirmed by the King of Poland and by Prince Radziwill in Lithuania. The last of these gipsy "kings" was Jan Marcinkiewicz, who died about 1790, and was recognised as "king" in 1778 by Karol Stanislaw Radziwill. In 1791 they were given settlements in Poland.

At the outset of the sixteenth century the gipsies entered Finland and also the north of Russia. Catharine II. put an end to their nomadic existence by settling them on the crown lands, with a guaranteed immunity from taxation for four years. Many of them are living in Bessarabia, at Bjelgorod, and in the neighbourhood of Taganrog; but these South Russian gipsies generally came into the country through Roumania, and not by the circuitous route through Poland. They met with far worse treatment in Sweden; the first mention of them in that



THE WANDERERS FROM BOHEMIA FIRST APPEARANCE OF THE GIPSIES IN FRANCE

country belongs to 1572. In 1662 they were banished by a royal decree which ordered the execution of any gipsy who returned. A Moravian decree of 1599 is couched in similar terms. Christian III. of Denmark, where the strangers had been known since 1420, issued a decree ordering them to leave the country within three months. After Frederick II. had reiterated this order in 1561, Denmark was soon freed from the intruders.

The Wanderers in England and Scotland

More fortunate was the fate of those scattered bodies who reached England about 1450 and Scotland about 1492; in spite of their proscription by Henry VIII. in 1531, and the decrees of his daughters Mary and Elizabeth, their numbers increased considerably. They were subject to a "king" from the Lee family; the last of these, King Joseph Lee, died in 1884. In 1827 a society was formed in England to improve the position of the gipsies.

In most of the Romance countries the gipsies met with an unfriendly reception so soon as they arrived. In 1422 they entered Italy (Bologna), but abandoned the country in a few years, as the clergy opposed them both in word and deed. The band which appeared in France in 1447 was allowed only five years of peace. When the gipsies plundered the little town of La Cheppe in the north-east of Châlons-sur-Marne, they were driven out by the peasants. In scattered bodies they travelled about the country until 1504. The first decree of banishment was then issued against them, and was repeated with greater stringency in 1539. Their extermination by fire and sword was decreed by the Parliament of Orléans in 1560, and was actually carried out by Louis XIII. and Louis XIV.

Only a small proportion of the gipsies were able to find refuge among the Basques, who had been visited by individual gipsies as early as 1538. But in the night of December 6th,

Spain's Favourable Reception

1802, the gipsies in that country were taken prisoners, with few exceptions, by the order of the prefect of the Basses Pyrénées and shipped to Africa. In Spain a band of gipsies appeared near Barcelona in 1447, and met with a favourable reception. They suffered little or no harm from the decree of banishment issued by Ferdinand the Catholic in 1499 and repeated in 1539, 1586, 1619, or from the prohibition of Philip IV.

in 1633, extended in 1661 and 1663, against their use of their own language and their nomadic habits. Greater, from another point of view, was the influence of the regulations of Charles III., of September 19th, 1783. To those gipsies who renounced the use of their "gerigonza" (gipsy language), wandering habits, and dress, this decree granted toleration; it threw open all offices to them, and allowed them to practise any trade, thereby furthering the process of denationalisation. In Southern Spain they continue a highly satisfactory existence at the present day.

Hungary and Transylvania formed the second resting-place, and in a sense the new home of the gipsies in Europe. They must have reached these countries shortly after 1400, for as early as 1416 gipsies from Hungary are found in Moravia, Bohemia, and Silesia, and in the rest of Germany in 1417. Those who wandered to Germany brought letters of commendation from the Hungarian Palatine Nicholas Gara to Constance, where the Emperor Sigismund was staying at that time; he was thus induced to grant them the charter

Hungarian Concessions to the Gipsies

previously mentioned — its existence is confirmed by a letter of the Hungarian Count Thurzó of the year 1616. The gipsies who were left in Hungary and Transylvania enjoyed certain privileges, like the Roumanians and Jews who possessed no land, as "serfs of the king," in so far as their settlement upon private property was conditional upon the royal consent. As armourers they also enjoyed the special favour of the ecclesiastical and secular authorities. Thus, on September 23rd, 1476, King Matthias allowed the town of Hermannstadt to employ the gipsies upon necessary works; and on April 3th, 1487, he ordered the voivode to leave undisturbed those gipsies who had been conceded to the people of Hermannstadt.

In 1496, Vladislav II. granted a charter to the voivode Thomas Polgar, whereby he and his people were to be left unmolested, as they were then preparing munitions of war for Sigismund, Bishop of Fünfskirchen. As in Poland, the dignity of gipsy king had been conferred upon nobles before 1731, so also in Transylvania and Hungary the ruler chose the chief voivode of the gipsies from the ranks of the nobility. In Transylvania the position was usually occupied by one nobleman,

THE STORY OF THE GIPSIES

and at times by two. In Hungary, on the other hand, there were always four chief voivodes, whose seats were Raab, Levá, Szatmár, and Kaschau. The gipsies were under their jurisdiction, and were obliged to pay a poll-tax of one florin a year. Under Peter Vallou, who was made chief voivode of Transylvania by Prince George Rakoczy, and even allowed to take the oath, the position was abolished by law.

From the date of their first appearance in the Theiss and Carpathian districts, the gipsies were especially famous as musicians. In this capacity they found employment at the courts of the princes and magnates; in 1525 they were even "installed" at the national assembly of Hatvan as musicians. Their yearning, heartrending melodies, composed, as it were, of passionate sighs, are played with incomparable purity, certainty and feeling. Soon this romantic people acquired a privileged position among the Hungarians; noble and citizen, peasant and student, alike delighted in the sound of a gipsy violin. These poetic nomads remain one of the most interesting features both of the Hungarian plains and of the Transylvanian forests. The fame of such gipsy musicians as Barna, Berkes, Bihari, Patikasus, Rácz, Salamon, or of the female violinist Zinka Panna, soon extended far beyond the frontiers.

Here, also in Transylvania and Hungary, are to be found the truest lyric poets among the gipsies, men living in joyful seclusion from the world, or considering the world only in the light of their own experience. The existence of a ballad poetry among the gipsies had long been denied, without due consideration of the fact that a people of such high musical talent could not fail to possess a store of ballads.

It is difficult to imagine anything more perfect than these lyrics, which are to be found among the wandering gipsies of Hungary and the Balkan territories by those who will take the pains to search. The authorship of these songs is unknown; they come forth from the people, and remain a national possession. One poetess only has left 250 gipsy poems in writing, the Servian wandering gipsy, Gima Ranjicic, who died in 1891. Beauty and education were the curse of her life. A reader of her poems published in a German trans-

lation can reconstruct a life of suffering, of desperate struggle, and unfulfilled hope. Beyond this, the intellectual achievements of the gipsies are few. Whether the Madonna painter Antonio de Solari, known as Il Zingaro (about 1382-1455), is to be accounted a gipsy is a matter of doubt. The gipsy women earn a fair amount of money by the practice of incantations, fortune-telling, card play, and the like, and enjoy a reputation among the villagers as leeches and magicians. In the belief of this outcast people there are women, and sometimes men, in possession of supernatural powers, either inherited or acquired. Most of the female magicians (*chahalji*; also known as "good women," *latche romni*) have been trained by their mothers from early childhood, and have inherited the necessary prestige. They play a considerable part in all the family festivals of the wandering gipsies.

In other countries these restless strangers have been forced to settle down; but most of the gipsies in Hungary, in the Balkans (the Mohammedan Zápóri), and in America continue their nomadic existence at the present day, almost invariably within the limits of one country or nationality; hence they are able to maintain their ancient customs more or less unchanged. But in these countries the governments have taken a truly benevolent interest in the gipsies, and have done their best to make them a civilised race. Thus, by a regulation of November 13th, 1761, the Queen-empress Maria Theresa ordered the name "gipsy" to be changed to that of "new Hungarian" (in Magyar, *új magyarok*) and the gipsies to be settled in the Banate. The authorities built them huts, and gave them seed, and even cattle; but as soon as the supplies were consumed the objects of this benevolence started again upon their wanderings. Only a small body remained and became a settled industrial community. On November 29th, 1767, Maria Theresa issued another and more stringent edict, to the effect that the gipsy children were to be taken away and brought up by "Christian" people at the expense of the state, while the marriage of gipsies was absolutely prohibited. This edict produced little or no effect in comparison with the trouble involved. On October 9th, 1783, Joseph II. issued a "general regula-

tion" containing the following severe conditions: gipsy children were not to run about naked in public places, and were to be taken early to school and to church. All children above four years of age must be redistributed every two years among the neighbouring communities in order to secure diversity of instruction. Adults were strictly prohibited from wandering; even the settled gipsies were only to visit the yearly market under special supervision. They were forbidden to trade as horse-dealers. The use of their language was forbidden under a penalty of twenty strokes, and intermarriage was strictly prohibited.

In the first half of the nineteenth

1870. Little effect was produced by the decree of the Hungarian ministry of the interior prohibiting vagrancy, issued on July 9th, 1867. The Archduke Joseph, who was well acquainted with the nomadic gipsies, settled several families, but in less than ten years they had all deserted their new home. The gipsies have a kind of "residence" in Debreczin, formerly a pure Magyar town. A few years ago the Hungarian Government announced their intention of taking the work of settlement in hand with greater seriousness.

Numbers of gipsies settle down every year under the pressure of circumstances. Thus, not only in Hungary, but also in the other countries of Europe, with the



A GIPSY ENCAMPMENT IN SCOTLAND
From the painting by Fred Walker.

century political confusion and attempts to secure freedom so entirely occupied the attention of the state that it was impossible to deal further with the gipsy problem. Attempts to settle the gipsies were made by private individuals. Bishop John Ham opened a gipsy school at Szatmar in 1857, and the priest, Ferdinand Farkas, founded an educational institution at Neuhäusel; both experiments speedily came to an end. The efforts of the Servian government to put an end to the wanderings of the Mohammedan tent gipsies, or *gurbeli*, were more successful between 1860 and

possible exception of Roumania, the number of gipsies is decreasing every year. In 1895 there were only 12,000 in the whole of the British Islands. In Prussia, where they were left in comparative peace until the ordinance of 1872, there are hardly 11,000; noteworthy are the small colonies which have survived in Lorraine from the French period in the parishes of Barental, Wiesenthal, and Götzenbruck. To-day there may be about nine hundred thousand gipsies in Europe and at least as many again in the other continents of the world. HEINRICH VON WLISLOCKI



BEFORE THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

THE MAGYARS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

THE district occupied by the modern state of Hungary was, long before the arrival of the Magyars (pronounced Madyars), a beaten track for immigrating nations and a battlefield and resting-place for the most different races. The valleys of Hungary breathed something of the attraction of primeval life. Powerful fortresses rose at an early period in the frontier districts, protecting the main roads. Long ago Kelts and Thracians invaded these districts and founded a kind of civilisation. The Romans then occupied the west and south, and in the course of two centuries created a flourishing community. The waves of the great migration, however, swept away the Roman settlers, together with the few barbarians inhabiting the country, into other districts. The Roman legions retired to Italy before the advancing Huns.

After the death of Attila, in 453 A.D., his kingdom fell to pieces; the Huns were incorporated with other races and disappeared from the scene. Goths, Gepids and Langobards now maintained their position for a longer or shorter time upon the arena and destroyed what scanty remnants of Roman civilisation had survived.

Struggles of Barbaric Hordes

These Teutonic hordes were in their turn driven out by the Avars, who occupied the eastern frontiers from 626, notwithstanding their defeat, until the Frankish Emperor Charles broke their power in 803. Their deserted territory was occupied by Slav nomads and some Bulgarians, together with the remnants of the Avars, until the end of the ninth century, when it was seized by the nation,

one of whose names it was henceforward to retain. The name "Hungarian" has no connection with the Huns. Ungari is merely a variant of Ungri = Ugri, Ugrians.

Probably the Magyars were originally settled in the south of Ingria, on the Isim, Irtish, Om, and in the wooded steppes of Baraba, but at an early period were driven into the districts between the Caspian and the Black Seas, where they settled between the Don and the Kuban, and became a fishing people. On this hypothesis they are a genuine branch of the Ugrian group of the Mongolian race, to which the Fins and the true Bulgarians belonged. It was the influence of their Hun neighbours that first induced these Ugrians to adopt cattle-breeding, an hereditary occupation of the Turkish nomads. The bracing effect of the dangers which threatened them on every side as they pushed forward in the vanguard of their race gradually changed their national character, with the result that they were eventually inferior to no Turkish nation in political capacity.

For a long period the Magyars paused in their migrations and settled in the plains on the Lower Don, where they had their chief market town in Karch. Muslim ben Abu Muslim ab-Garmi (about 830-845), and other Arabs constantly confused the Magyars with the Bashkirs, who resembled them in nationality and name, and were settled eastward of the Pechenegs in the steppes between the Ural and Caspian seas, bounded on the north by the Isgil Bulgarians on the

Kama; to this confusion is due the hypothesis, long vigorously supported, of a "Magna Hungaria" in South-east Russia as the first home of the Magyars.

The truth is that their district, which lay upon the Maeotis, bordered that of the Alans, Khazars and Bulgarians, and extended to the Kuban on the north-west end of the Caucasus; it was known as "Lebedia" to Constantine VII. Porphyrogenetos. About 833 these Western Turkish Khazars found themselves so oppressed by the Magyars that they applied for protection to the Emperor Theophilus. The result was the construction of a fortified trench and the building of the brick fortress of Sarkel on the Don. Cut off in this direction by the Khazars, the Magyars removed to the Lower Danube in 839-840, where they intervened in the Bulgarian and Greek struggles.

Soon we find them loosely dependent upon the Khazars. However, when these latter, in alliance with the Guzes of the Sea of Aral, drove the Pechenegs from their possessions between Atil and Jajyk this movement proved unfavourable for the Magyars, for the Pechenegs had been little weakened, and now appeared in a hostile attitude upon the Don; the Magyars, therefore, about 862, turned their backs upon Lebedia, which was henceforward closed against them, and established themselves to the west of the Dnieper, on the Bug and Dniester. This new home is repeatedly referred to as Atelkuzu. The khan of the Khazars was equally hard pressed, and made a proposal to Lebedias, the first tribal chieftain of the Magyars in Chelandia, to become prince of the Magyars under his supremacy. He, however, declined the proposal.

Although hemmed in by the Khazars and Magyars, the power of the Pechenegs grew rapidly. After the years 880-890

the Magyars found it impossible to continue their marauding expeditions eastward; for this reason they abandoned Atelkuzu, which had lost its value for them, and had become absolutely unsafe in the east upon the Dnieper, and moved further westward in 889. This second and final forced movement of the Magyars from the north shore of the Black Sea is of importance in the history of the world; driven forward by the Pechenegs, and also from the Balkan Peninsula, which at the invitation of the Byzantines they had devastated in 894, from the Pruth and Sereth, to meet with expulsion in 895 from the bold Bulgarian Symeon, the Magyars

in 896 pushed their way like a wedge amid the South-east European Slavs; here they remained and developed their civilisation, and for a thousand years continued to occupy this position.

The Magyars advanced into the districts of the Theiss and Danube, across the North Carpathians, through the pass of Vereczke. It is said that the chieftains of the several races—together with Arpad and his son Liuntis, who ruled the predominant tribe of the Kabars, Kursan is also mentioned—executed a closer form of agreement upon this journey; choosing Arpad as their leader, they concluded a

"blood-treaty" by catching blood from their arms in a basin and drinking it. The nomadic races who had spent their previous existence on the steppes of Hungary were at once attracted by the flat country which surrounded them in their new home in Pannonia, with its great expanses, its pellucid atmosphere, and its lack of colour. Like every steppe people, they were accustomed to live in a state of warfare, and depended partly upon the booty which they were able to extort from their settled neighbours by their bold cavalry raids. Some time, however, before their



ARPAD, THE LEADER OF THE MAGYARS
Chosen by the chieftains as the leader of their race, by concluding a "blood-treaty," each chief making a wound in his own arm and drinking the blood.

How Arpad was
Chosen by
"Blood-treaty"

THE MAGYARS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

appearance in the plains of the Theiss they had progressed beyond the savagery of a primitive race.

The occupation of this new home was effected without difficulty; there was, in fact, no one to bar the way. The scanty population was soon incorporated with the new arrivals, who first settled in the plains of the lowlands, where they found abundant pasturage for their herds of horses and cattle. From this base of operations they then extended their rule towards the natural frontiers of the region they occupied. Their only conflicts took place on the north-west, in the district of the Waag River, and finally Moravia Major succumbed to their attacks in 906. The several chieftains settled with their tribes in the places appointed to them, and built themselves castles, which served as central points both for defence and for economic exploitation. Arpad himself took possession of Attila's castle, in the ruins of which, according to the somewhat unreliable *Gesta Hungarorum* of the anonymous secretary of King Bela, the Hungarians "held their daily festivals; they sat in rows in the palace of Attila, and the sweet tones of harps and shawms and the songs of the singers sounded before them." Minstrels sang the exploits of fallen heroes to the accompaniment of the lute, and story-tellers related legends of the heroes of old.

The warlike spirit of the brave Hungarians found, however, little satisfaction in this peaceful occupation. They invaded Upper Italy in 899, 921, 924, 941-942, 947 and 951, Saxony in 915, Central and even South Italy in the winter of 921; in 922, 926, and 937 they raided Burgundy; South-west Franconia in 924, 937, and 951, and Suabia in 937. Advancing upon their hardy steeds they ravaged and plundered far and wide. They held

Central Europe terror-stricken for half a century; then, laden with rich booty and slaves, they returned home. The Czechs, who had become the neighbours of the Magyars after the fall of Moravia, often suffered from their raids. On July 5th, 907, the Bavarians experienced a

Death of Arpad

severe blow. After 924 a Magyar division from Venice appears to have joined in a piratical raid, conducted by the Emir Thamar of Tarsus; others made their way to Galicia and Andalusia about 943. Neither the death of Arpad, in 907, nor the defeat inflicted upon them in 933 by the German king Henry the Fowler put an end to their extensive raids;



FOUNDER OF THE HUNGARIAN KINGDOM
With the rule of Geza, great grandson of Arpad, the Magyars passed from nomadism to a settled nationality and his son Stefan I., who reigned as king of Hungary from 997 till 1038, consolidated the kingdom of which he was the real creator.

in 934, in alliance with or under the rule of some hordes of Pechenegs, part of whom had been converted to Mohammedanism about 915, they undertook an invasion of the East Roman Empire, upon a scale which reminds one of the typical crusade; they devastated the boundary fortress of Valandar and advanced to the walls of Constantinople. In 943 and 948 this attempt was repeated upon a similar scale. It was not until 955, when they suffered a dreadful defeat at Augsburg and lost the East Mark of Germany for the second time, that a considerable transformation took place in the intellectual and social life of the

Magyar nation. Contact with foreigners, even by way of enmity, and in particular the large immigration of foreign Slavs, who had amalgamated with the Hungarian nation, had brought about a new state of affairs, and convinced the upper classes that no nation could live by military power alone in the midst of peaceful nationalities. The great grandson of Arpad, "the duke" Geza (972 to 997), accepted Christianity. His government marks the point at which the Hungarians passed from the simple conditions of life in their heathen nomad state to the position of a settled nation.

When Wajk, the son of Geza, who was baptised as Stefan I., ascended the throne in 997, he found the path already prepared; in the course of four decades he was able to complete the work of civilisation begun by his father, and to secure for Hungary a position among the nationalities of Europe. With statesmanlike insight he

Stefan joined, not the Greek, but the
Brings Hungary Roman Church, and thereby
to Rome threw open his country to the new intellectual move-

ment which was beginning to stir the West. His German wife, Gisela, a daughter of the Bavarian duke Henry II. who died in 995, was his faithful supporter in these labours. The Pope, Silvester II. (999-1003), in recognition of his services to Christianity, in 1000 conferred upon him the dignity of king together with extraordinary ecclesiastical privileges for himself and his successors. By the foundation of monasteries and bishoprics Stefan laid a firm basis for the organisation of the Roman Church in Hungary. Many tribal chieftains certainly took up arms against these innovations, but Christianity took firm root after a short time. In particular, the worship of the Virgin Mary was rapidly popularised, owing to her easy identification with their own Nagyasszony, the "mother of the gods."

King Stefan also introduced innovations in military, judicial, and economic institutions. He effected nothing less than a revolution in the domestic and public life of his subjects. To him is due the division of the country into *comitates* or counties. In spite of the fact that his constructive activity was directed chiefly to works of peace, he was forced on several occasions to take up arms. After a victorious campaign against the Pechenegs and Mieczyslav II. of Poland, the successor of Boleslav Chabri, he was obliged to measure his strength, after 1030, with the German emperor, Conrad II., and in the

The Great peace of 1031 was able to extend
Work of his kingdom westwards
Saint Stefan beyond the Fischa to the Leitha and Danube. The

remainder of his life the great king spent in mourning for the loss of his son Emerich. On August 15th, 1038, the real creator of the Hungarian kingdom ended his laborious existence; deeply revered by his people, he was canonised by the Church in 1087. Stefan the Saint was succeeded by Peter Orseolo (1038-1041 and 1044-1046),

Samuel Aba (1041-1044), Andreas I. (1046 to December, 1060), and Bela I. (1060-1063), whose daughter Sophie is regarded by the Askanians, the Hohenstauffen, the Guelfs, and the Wittelsbachs as their common ancestor. Then followed Salomon from 1063 to 1074—he married in 1063 Judith, or Sophie, the daughter of the Emperor Henry III. and of Agnes of Poitou—and Geza I. (1074-1077). During this period development was impeded by quarrels about the succession, and internal disturbances. The efforts of the German Empire to maintain the supremacy which had been secured over Hungary in 1044 came to an end in 1052 with the fruitless siege of Pressburg undertaken by the Emperor Henry III.; the campaign of Henry IV. in 1074 was equally unproductive of definite result. The last efforts of heathendom were crushed with the suppression of a revolt begun by the heathen population under their tribal chieftain Vatha, killed 1046, and his reputed son Janos, who died about 1060.

St. Ladislaus I. (1077-August 29th, 1095) and Koloman the author (1095-1114) were able to continue the reforming work of Stefan. Towards the end of the eleventh century Hungary occupied an important position among the independent states of Europe. St. Ladislaus, who survived in Hungarian legend as a type of bravery and knightly character, incorporated the inland districts of Croatia with his kingdom, founded a bishopric at Agram in 1091, and divided his new acquisition into counties. His successor, Koloman, whose interests were primarily scholastic and ecclesiastical, though he also turned his attention to legislation, subdued the Dalmatian towns with the object of erecting a barrier against the growing power of Venice. From this time Croatia has remained a component part of the Hungarian territory.

While the empire was extending its boundaries westward, the eastern frontier was troubled by the Cumanians. In 1091, when the authorities were occupied with Croatia, this nation made a devastating invasion into Hungary; Ladislaus captured most of them in two campaigns, and settled them in the districts of the Theiss. He did his best to introduce security of property. In the momentous struggle between the Pope and the

THE MAGYARS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

empire he promised to support the Roman Church against the Emperor Henry IV., but was far-sighted enough to take no direct part in the quarrel. In the year 1192 he was canonised. During the government of Koloman, the first Crusaders, led by Count Emiko of Leiningen, marched through the land in disorderly array, and were for that reason driven beyond the frontier, while a friendly reception was extended to Godfrey de Bouillon.

After the death of Koloman, his weak-minded and dissipated son Stefan II. occupied the throne from 1116 to 1131; during his government the Venetians recovered the

larger part of the Dalmatian district. When he died without issue, the Hungarians submitted to Bela II. (1131-1141), who, together with his father, Duke Almos of Croatia, had been previously blinded by King Koloman for participation in a revolt. Hardly had the blind king entered upon his government when the country was invaded by Borics, the son of Koloman by a Russian wife, Eufemia, who had been divorced for adultery. Borics

was supported by the Polish Duke Boleslav III., who was put to flight by the German troops of the king.

On the death of Bela II. his son Geza II., who was a minor, came to the throne (1141 to May, 1161), and Borics then attempted to secure the help of the Crusaders, who were passing through Hungary. However, the Emperor Conrad and King Louis VII. declined to support this hazardous project. Borics now fled to the Byzantine Emperor Manuel. This ruler had inspired further life into the

decaying Byzantine Empire, and was attempting to make Greek influence once more preponderant in the Balkan Peninsula. As Hungary stood in the way of his plans

he attempted to undermine her independence by every means in his power. At the instigation of Borics he invaded the south of Hungary, but was driven back by Geza II. and forced to make peace. Borics afterwards met his death at the head of Greek troops in a conflict with the Cumanians. The Emperor Manuel now took the Dukes Stefan and Ladislaus under his protection; they had sought refuge with him

after revolting against their brother Geza in 1158. Under this ruler took place the first great migration of the Germans to Northern Hungary and Transylvania. On the death of Geza the Hungarian throne naturally fell by inheritance to his son Stefan III. (1161-1172), but Manuel by means of bribery secured the election of his favourite Ladislaus II. in 1162. After his early death the Emperor Manuel brought forward Stefan IV., the other brother of Geza,

as an opposition king; Stefan, however, was speedily abandoned by his supporters and overthrown by Stefan III. in 1164, in alliance with the Premyslid Vladislav II. Manuel concluded peace with Stefan III. and took his brother Bela to Constantinople to be educated. The danger which Byzantium threatened to the Hungarian Empire came to an end in 1180, with the death of the Emperor Manuel; shortly before that date he had given Hungary a king in the person of Bela III. (1172 to April 20th, 1196), who used his Greek education solely for the



TYPES OF THE ANCIENT MAGYARS

The history of this people, said to be a branch of the Mongolian race, dates back to the sixth century. They are described as possessing "regular features, shapely figures, black hair and eyes, dark complexion, impulsive temperament, and intense patriotic feeling."

benefit of the people. Bela III. recovered the Dalmatian districts and Syrmia from the Venetians, and occupied Galicia for some time. By his marriage with Margaret, the sister of Philip Augustus of France, French customs were introduced into Hungary. Andreas II., the son of Bela III. (1205-1235), overthrew his brother

**French
Customs
Introduced**

Emerich, who died in the middle of September, 1204, and also his son Ladislaus III., who died on May 7th, 1205, in Vienna, and undertook a crusade on his own account in 1217. On his return home he lived in a continual state of dissension with his nobles. After a long struggle, in which the malcontents, under the leadership of Benedict Bor, otherwise Bank ban, killed the Queen Gertrude in 1213, Andreas II. issued the "Golden Bull"—a piece of legislation of the first importance to the Hungarian constitution. By this measure he broke the power of the counts and gave extensive privileges to the ecclesiastical and secular nobility of lower rank, securing to the latter a permanent influence upon government legislation and administration.

Under the government of his son, Bela IV. (1235-1270), the Mongols of Batu invaded the country in March, 1241, and spread appalling devastation for a year. The Austrian duke, Frederick II. the Valiant, the last of the Babenbergs, meanwhile occupied the West and plundered the treasures of Queen Maria, who had taken refuge with him. After the departure of the invading hordes the king returned home from Dalmatia, and with the help of the Knights of St. John soon restored prosperity and undertook a campaign against the Austrian duke, who fell, leaving no issue, in the battle of Vienna Neustadt on June 15th, 1246. Bela IV. now occupied his valuable heritage, but in July, 1260, was forced to divide it with the Bohemian king, Premysl Ottokar II., and finally to renounce it

**Bohemian
Supremacy in
Hungary**

entirely since the power of Bohemia extended to the Adriatic Sea, and in Germany the "dreadful period without an emperor" of the interregnum had begun.

Ladislaus IV. (1272-1290), the son of Stefan V. (1270-1272), and a grandson of Bela IV., helped the Hapsburg ruler to win a victory for Ottokar at Dürnkrut on August 26th, 1278, and then wasted his time in dissipation and feasting with the

Cumanians, to whom he was related through his mother, the daughter of a Cumanian chief. He was hardly able to expel the Tartar invaders. On August 31st, 1290, he was murdered by a company of his dearest friends, the Cumanians. Rudolf of Hapsburg made an unjustifiable attempt to hand over Hungary to his son Albert, as a vacant fief of the empire; his real object, however, was to secure concessions in that quarter.

The male line of the house of Arpad became extinct after Andreas III. He was recognised only by Dalmatia and Croatia (1290 to January 14th, 1301), being opposed by Charles Martel of Anjou, who died in 1295, a stepson of Rudolf of Hapsburg and a protégé of Nicholas IV. Under the government of the Arpads the Hungarian nation had imbibed the spirit of Christian civilisation, though without sacrificing their natural interests on the altar of religion. The general policy of the Arpads had been to connect the development of the Hungarian nationality with Western civilisation, and to put down infidelity and barbarism with the sword. The country was covered with churches,

**Christianity and
Early Hungarian
Literature**

monasteries, and schools, of which latter the high school at Vessprim soon became a scientific and artistic centre. No less obvious is the influence of Christianity in the most ancient remains of Hungarian literature. The first book written in the Hungarian language at the outset of the thirteenth century is the "Funeral Service with Proper Prayers"; this service clearly reflects the spirit of the nation which had so long wandered upon the storm-lashed plains and only a short time before had buried its dead with their horses.

Upon the extinction of the male line of the Arpads several members of the female line came forward with claims to the vacant throne. Charles Robert, the grandson of Maria, daughter of Stefan V., was a member of the Neapolitan Anjou family, and had secured a considerable following from 1295, even during the lifetime of Andreas III.; however, the Hungarians, if we may believe the somewhat questionable traditions on the point, elected the king, Wenzel II. (Wenceslaus) of Bohemia, whose mother, Kunigunde of Halicz, was descended from the family of the Arpads. He did not accept the election, but handed over the Hungarian



MARGARET, QUEEN OF HUNGARY, SETTING OUT FOR PALESTINE

The daughter of Louis VII., King of France, Margaret became the second wife of Bela III., and was the means of introducing into Hungary much of the refinement and elegance which, even at that early period, distinguished the French court. After the death of Bela, in 1196, Henry VI., Emperor of Germany, determined upon sending an army to aid the Crusaders in Palestine, and at the head of the troops furnished by Hungary, Margaret, the youthful widow, set out in person. Margaret was not destined to return from her voluntary expedition, as she died in Palestine.

crown to his son, Wenzel III., who assumed the name of Ladislaus V., as king in 1302.

However, the party of Charles Robert caused Ladislaus so much trouble during his stay in the country that he returned to Bohemia in 1304. The party of Wenzel now elected Otto III., Duke of Lower Bavaria (1305 to 1308), whose mother, Elizabeth, was also a descendant of the house of Arpad. While upon a visit to Transylvania he fell into the hands of the Transylvanian voivode, Ladislaus Apor, in 1307; after spending a year in captivity he secured his freedom, abdicated the crown, left the country, and died in 1312.

By means of the intervention of the Pope, Charles Robert was chosen king; he was able to secure the predominance of the house of Anjou in Hungary for nearly a century. He proved an admirable ruler, who not only kept the oligarchy

In Touch With Italian Culture in check, but also improved the prosperity of Hungary by the introduction of a reformed system of defence and of agriculture; he also brought the nation into immediate contact with Italian civilisation. He secured the crown of Poland to his son and successor, Lewis, and the crown of Naples came under his influence by the marriage of his other son, Andreas.

On the death of Charles Robert his son Lewis I. came to the throne (1342 to 1382), and Hungary secured a highly educated and knightly ruler, to whom she gladly gave the title of "the Great." Lewis introduced a beneficial innovation by a regulation which obliged the territorial serfs to pay a ninth of the products of their fields and vineyards to the nobility, in order that these might the more easily be able to fulfil the heavy obligation of supplying troops for military service; by prohibiting the alienation of noble lands from the families which owned them, this Angevin introduced the Hungarian custom of *aviticilas*—that is, hereditary succession. To this reform Lewis the Great owed his brilliant military successes.

His attention was soon claimed by the confusion in the kingdom of Naples, where his brother Andreas had been murdered by his own wife, Joanna I., in 1345. Lewis appeared in Naples with a large army at the close of 1347, conquered the town, and inflicted punishment upon the supporters of his sister-in-law, who fled to Provence. This victory of the Hungarian arms in Naples considerably raised the prestige of Lewis throughout Europe. Owing to the opposition of Pope Clement VI. he was unable to take permanent possession

of the conquered territory, but the long stay which he made in Italy (1347, 1348-1350) had a great influence upon the education of his nobles. In two campaigns, 1356 and 1358, he humbled the republic of Venice, and finally reconquered Dalmatia from Quarnero to Durazzo. For a short period (1365-1369) he also occupied part of Bulgaria. It was under his government that Christian Europe was first threatened by the Turkish advance into the Balkan Peninsula; this advance he prevented in 1366 for some time. To secure his dynasty and extend it, he betrothed his daughter, the heiress Maria, to Sigismund of Luxemburg, a younger son by a fourth marriage of the German Emperor Charles IV.; his other daughter, Hedwig, was betrothed to William, Duke of Austria. Both, however, died without children. Lewis did not secure possession of the crown of Poland until 1370; his power now extended from the Baltic to the Adriatic, and for a time even to the Black Sea. These acquisitions of territory increased his prestige and his influence among the states of Europe, but contributed very little to the consolidation of the Hungarian kingdom owing to the undisciplined nature of the Polish nobility and the favouritism of his mother Elizabeth. As Lewis I. had no sons, his daughter Maria (1382 to 1385) ascended the throne after his death, but was unable to maintain her position. Poland fell into the hands of her sister Hedwig, who had become the wife of Jagellon of Lithuania. How-

ever, in Hungary Maria was forced to deal at once with certain revolted noble families, who called to the throne, in 1385, King Charles III., the younger of Durazzo, from Naples. This Angevin king was crowned as Charles II., and after a reign of thirty-six days was assassinated on February 24th, 1386. The nobles took Maria prisoner, and her mother Elizabeth they strangled. Maria's husband, Sigismund of Luxemburg, appeared at the right moment in Hungary with a Bohemian army of Wenzel to free his consort from imprisonment, and the regency was entrusted to him at the close of March, 1387. While these disturbances undermined the power of Hungary from within, the Ottomans were continuing their conquests in the Balkan Peninsula. In

1389 the fate of Servia was decided. In 1393 the fortress of Widdin fell, the house of the Sismanids of Tirnovo was overthrown, and Bulgaria became an Ottoman province. Sigismund then turned for help to the Christian states of Western Europe. However, his splendid army,

half composed of Hungarians, was destroyed at Nicopoli by the Turks, with the loss of more than 50,000 men. South Hungary soon became a desert. Sigismund then found himself entangled in a long and fruitless war with Venice for the possession of Dalmatia. As German Emperor his attention was



LEWIS THE GREAT

The greatest figure in Hungary before Hunyadi. He reigned from 1342 till 1382, and besides greatly extending the power and territory of his country, advanced its civilisation.



QUEEN MARIA AND HER CONSORT SIGISMUND

These old woodcuts represent Maria, the daughter of Lewis the Great, and her husband, Sigismund of Luxemburg. The latter, who was also German Emperor, was made regent of Hungary in 1387.

long occupied, after 1410 and 1411, by ecclesiastical difficulties. By the burning of the reformer, John Huss, the Hussite heresy was widely spread in Bohemia.

THE MAGYARS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

and the devastating influence of the movement extended also to Northern Hungary.

After a reign of fifty years Sigismund died and left the throne to the husband of his daughter Elizabeth, Albert of Austria. Under his government (1437-1439), Hungary nearly fell into the hands of the Turks, and was saved from destruction only by John or Janos Hunyadi, Baron of Szolnok and Count of Temesvar; he was one of the most capable generals and noblest figures in the Magyar nation. After the unexpected death of Albert, disturbances broke out at home and abroad. One party of the nobles chose Vladislav III. of Poland, while another

deceived by the optimism of the papacy, broke the treaty. The result of this rashness was his total defeat at the battle of Varna on November 10th, 1444, where Vladislav and Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini lost their lives. During the minority of

King Ladislaus V. Posthumus, Hunyadi was chosen regent of the empire, and ruled from June 5th, 1446, to Christmas, 1452. He devoted superhuman efforts to checking the aggrandisement of the nobility and the advance of the Turks. After the capture of Constantinople bands of Turks appeared before Belgrade. Owing to the enthusiastic preaching of the Minorite, John of Capistrano, the people joined



THE HISTORIC CASTLE OF JOHN HUNYADI, THE GREAT HERO OF HUNGARY

offered the crown to Ladislaus (Posthumus), the son of Albert, born after his death on February 22nd, 1440. These quarrels about the succession came to an end only upon the death of the queen widow, Elizabeth, on December 10th, 1442. In the end Vladislav I. secured recognition (1442-1444). The brilliant successes which Hunyadi had gained over the Turks on the occasion of their incursion into Transylvania and South Hungary in 1442 inspired the king to attack the enemy in his own country in 1443; he was defeated, and forced to conclude the peace of Szegedin in the middle of 1444. A few days afterwards Vladislav,

**Hunyadi's
Victories Over
the Turks**

the army of Hunyadi in such numbers that he was able to relieve Belgrade with great rapidity (July 21st, 1456). The whole of Europe was delighted with this brilliant feat of arms. However, on August 11th John Hunyadi ended his heroic life. The memory of this great man was but little honoured by King Ladislaus. Persuaded by the calumnies of the dead man's enemies, he executed his son Ladislaus, who had murdered the influential Count Ulrich of Cilli in Belgrade; the other son, Matthias, he took with him into captivity in Prague. After the sudden death of King Ladislaus V., on November 23rd, 1457, shortly before the arrival of his consort, Isabella of France, Matthias

returned home, and was placed upon the throne by the nobility on January 24th, 1458. Thus the short connection between Hungary and Bohemia again terminated for the moment. The thirty-two years of the reign of King Matthias Hunyadi (1458-

Hunyadi's 1490), known as Corvinus, from **Able Son on** his coat of arms, is the second **the Throne** period of prosperity and the last effort at independence on the part of Old Hungary. With an iron hand Matthias secured peace at home by the stern punishment of the rebellious nobles, and by making the grant of offices and dignities conditional upon good service. His government

is a series of military and political successes, accompanied by a steady advance in intellectual and economic progress. The Hussite, John Giskra, who had occupied almost all the fortified possessions in Upper Hungary, recognised the power of the young king and came over to his service in 1462. Matthias became entangled in the changing vicissitudes of a long war with the Emperor Frederick III., who had been joined by the dissatisfied nobles; the struggle was brought to an end between 1485 and 1487 by the permanent conquest of Vienna, of Austria below the Enns, and some parts of Styria. The troubles in Bohemia were satisfactorily terminated by the conventions of Ofen and Olmütz on September 30th, 1478, and on July 21st, 1479; these secured to Corvinus the title of King of Bohemia, and gave him possession of Moravia and the duchies of Silesia and Lausitz. He undertook a great expedition against the Turks, who marched triumphantly into Breslau and Vienna. When they invaded Transylvania he sent Count Paul Kinizsi of Temesvar to help the Voivode Stefan Bathori; they defeated the enemy on the Brotfeld at Broos on October 13th, 1479. Under the government of Corvinus the Turkish danger lost its threatening character for some time; by

the organisation of a standing army, the "Black Squadron," which maintained good discipline, he created a military power, the admirable organisation of which acted as a strong barrier against the storm advancing from the south.

At that period the new spirit of humanism was potent at the king's palace at Ofen, in the castles of the bishops, and in the high schools. Matthias was entirely under its influence. The movement of the renaissance found an enthusiastic reception and a ready support, not only in the seats of Dionys Szechy and John Vitez, the ecclesiastical princes of Gran and Grosswardein, but also at the king's court. Italian masters, including Benedetto da Majono (1442-1497), built and decorated a royal palace in which historians, poets, and rhetoricians assembled. The prothonotary, John of Thuróc, continued his "Chronicum pictum Vin-

dobonense" to the year 1464, while Antonio Bonfini, the "Hungarian Livy," who died in 1502, wrote the king's history, and Martino Galeotti, who died in 1478, collected his decrees.


Among the circle of scholars who gathered round Corvinus, a European reputation was won by Marsilio Ficino and by the later Bishop of Fünfkirchen, Janus Pannonius, with his Latin epics, elegies, and epigrams. King Matthias had one

of the most famous libraries of his time, the "Corvina," containing about 3,000 manuscripts and 60,000 volumes; it was carried off by the Turks, and a few scanty remnants of it now existing

Brilliant were sent back from Stamboul in 1869 and 1877. The **Age of** period which ended with the **Corvinus** death of this second Hunyadi was indeed a brilliant age. Its influence was transmitted to the minds of the coming generation, and facilitated the transition to the Reformation, which in Hungary found minds prepared to receive it by the intellectual culture of that age.



HUNYADI, THE HERO OF HUNGARY
John, or Janos, Hunyadi was the saviour of his country, as it was due to his military prowess that Hungary was saved from the Turkish yoke in the middle of the fifteenth century.



JOHN HUNYADIS SON, MATTHIAS CORVINUS, AND GEORGE PODIEBRAD IN THE CAMP BEFORE SPIELBERG IN 1463

On April 6th, 1490, King Matthias died at Venice at the age of fifty. The creation of a powerful Danube kingdom, which the genius of the great Corvinus had brought to pass, proved to be of a transitory nature. He had married twice, but there

Death of the Great Corvinus

were no children either by his first wife Katharina Podiebrad, or by the second, Beatrice of Aragon, whose praises are sung by Bonfini. With the consent of the nobles he therefore designated his natural son, the Duke John Corvinus, as his successor. Seduced from their promises by the intrigues of Queen Beatrice, the ecclesiastical and secular dignitaries elected to the throne the Bohemian King Vladislav, a member of the family of the Jagiells or Jagellon family; his younger brother, John Albert, who had been brought forward during his minority, gave up his claim on February 20th, 1491, in return for compensation in Silesia.

Beatrice had supported the election of Vladislav in the hope that she would marry the king, who was still a bachelor, but in this she was entirely deceived. The great nobles were tired of the iron rule of Matthias, and longed for a weak king under whom the power of their families could be extended as they pleased. From this point of view Vladislav II. (1490-1516) fully realised their hopes; he lived at Ofen, a mere figurehead, who with his nobles carried on the government and bought peace from foreign enemies at the price of disgraceful conditions.

The Roman Emperor Maximilian reconquered Vienna and the Austrian territories. The great nobles laid heavy burdens upon the towns and serfs, and made them feel inexorably the weight of their recovered power and dominion. At the same time John Zapolya, Count of Zips, one of the richest territorial

owners, was secretly aiming at the throne; in 1505 he induced the estates to decree that they would not again elect a foreigner in case Vladislav should die leaving no male heir. To secure his family interests Vladislav in 1515 made a convention with the Emperor Maximilian regarding the succession, and betrothed his son Lewis to the Archduchess Maria, the emperor's granddaughter, and his daughter Anna to the Archduke Ferdinand.

A short time before—in 1514—a terrible revolt of the peasants had broken out under the leadership of George Dozsas. Zapolya caused the "belliger cruciferorum" (leader of the Crusaders) to be

burnt upon a red-hot iron throne, and reduced the country to a state of apparent peace; but the misery and distress of the common people had risen to a high pitch.

After the death of King Vladislav, the throne was occupied by his son Lewis II., then ten years of age (1516-1526); during his minority the affairs of state were

conducted by a regency of three. In the midst of the disastrous party struggles which were continually fostered by Zapolya, the ambassador of Suleiman appeared in Ofen and offered peace on condition that Hungary should pay the yearly tribute to the sultan. The demand was refused and the emissary imprisoned, though no measures were taken to protect the

frontier. When Suleiman invaded the country in 1526, Lewis II. was able to bring only a small army against him. The disaster of Mohacs, on August 29th, cost the childless king his life and put an end to the unity of the Hungarian state. Suleiman captured Ofen, devastating the country far and wide, and marched home in October, retaining only Syrmia, to secure his possession of Belgrade.



KING MATTHIAS AND BEATRICE OF ARAGON

Matthias, the greatest son of John Hunyadi, died in 1490 after a brilliant reign, though he had not succeeded in creating a great Danube kingdom. Beatrice was his second wife, and he left no heir.



THE HAPSBURG POWER IN HUNGARY AND THE SPREAD OF PROTESTANTISM

HARDLY had the Turks retired when disputes about the succession broke out. One portion of the nobility chose John Zápolya as king on November 10th, 1526; the remainder, on the ground of the compact concerning the succession which they had concluded with Vladislav, raised the Archduke Ferdinand, a brother of Charles V. and king of Bohemia, to the throne on the 16th and 17th of December. Ferdinand appeared with an army in the summer of 1527, captured Ofen on August 20th, and drove the opposition king, Zápolya, to Poland. However, after the retirement of Ferdinand, Zápolya returned with the help of Suleiman, conquered Ofen, and accompanied the sultan's advance to the walls of Vienna on September 21st, 1529. The attempt of the Turk to conquer Vienna was unsuccessful. However, Zápolya was able to secure the Hungarian throne with his help, while Ferdinand retained his hold only of the countries bordering on Austria. Henceforward, for nearly two centuries Hungary became a battlefield and the scene of bloody conflicts between armies advancing from east and west respectively. French policy, which was working in Germany, Italy, and Constantinople to undermine the growing power of the house of Hapsburg, induced the sultan to undertake a second campaign in June, 1532, against Vienna. On the march, however, his quarter of a million soldiers were stopped by the seven hundred men of Nicholas, who held out for three weeks before the little fortress of Güns, so that the Turk was obliged to give up his project; he returned home, devastating the country as he went. This movement eventually induced the two kings to come to a reconciliation on February 24th, 1538, at Grosswardein. Each ruler was to retain the district which he had in possession, and after the death of John Zápolya the whole country, including that beyond the Theiss and Transylvania, was to be

inherited by Ferdinand; any future son born to the Magyar was to receive only Zips as a duchy.

This peace was, however, dissolved in 1539 by the marriage of John Zápolya with the Polish Duchess Isabella, who bore him a son, John Sigismund, in 1540. By the help of the Croatian, George Utis-
Treachery of the Sultan senich, known as Martinuzzi, Bishop of Grosswardein, the Queen Isabella, who became a widow in 1540, was able to secure the recognition of her son as king. The Porte promised protection. However, on September 2nd, 1541, the sultan treacherously occupied Ofen, and incorporated it with his own kingdom. The little John Sigismund was left by the Turks in possession only of Transylvania and of some districts on the Theiss, while the northern and western counties remained in the hands of Ferdinand. The latter afterwards secured the help of Martinuzzi in December, 1541, under the convention of Gyula. The Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg and the Duke Maurice of Saxony made an attempt to recover Ofen at the end of September, 1542, but were hindered by insufficiency of means.

In view of the threatening aspect of the Turks, Martinuzzi persuaded the queen in 1548 to surrender her territory in return for an indemnity. Isabella and John Sigismund came to an agreement in 1551 with the Silesian duchies of Oppeln and Ratibor, while John Castaldo, Ferdinand's field-marshal, occupied Transylvania, and "Frater Georgius" was rewarded with a cardinal's hat. As Ferdinand's army was not strong enough to dispel the attack, Martinuzzi attempted to gain time by negotiating with the Porte. This aroused the suspicion of Castaldo. On December 17th, 1551, he caused Martinuzzi to be treacherously murdered in the castle of Alvincz by the Marchese Alphonso Sforza-Pallavicini and the private secretary Marcantonio Ferrari. In view of repeated

**Queen Isabella
Surrenders
Territory**

attempts to accentuate the devotion of the Austrian hereditary territories and the value of the contingents offered by the German Empire, it is worth pointing out that the very dexterous policy of "brother George" was dangerous to Hungary, inas-

Transylvania Under the Ottoman Heel

much as it served to clear the way for the inevitable supremacy of the Turks. Isabella and John Sigismund soon returned to Transylvania, which now became a permanent vassal state of Turkey, though it received full religious freedom in 1557. Ferdinand, one of the best princes of his age, could not oppose the victorious advance of the Ottomans, for at that time the interests of the Hapsburgs extended over half Europe, and he could not use his power against the Porte alone. Temesvar fell in 1552, notwithstanding the heroic defence of Stefan Losonczi; in Dregely, George Szondy died a hero's death, with the whole of the garrison. Castaldo was forced to retire from Transylvania in 1556, and peace secured the sultan in the receipt of a yearly tribute from Ferdinand.

After Ferdinand's death, his son and successor Maximilian (1564-1576) became entangled in the war with John Sigismund in the very first year of his reign. The result was a fresh campaign of the Turks, in the course of which Nikolaus Zrinyi met his death, with the whole of his garrison, in the fortress of Szigetvar on September 7th, 1566. John Sigismund Zápolya now founded a principality of Transylvania under Turkish supremacy, but on the condition that the estates should on every occasion have free choice of their prince. After his death, in 1571, Stefan Báthori (1571-1575), a far-seeing and important man, was placed upon the new throne; however, in December, 1575, he exchanged his throne for the more ancient kingdom of Poland, as the husband of the Jagellon princess Anna. As regards

the services of the Hungarian nobility, who did their best to break away from the Hapsburgs and lived in constant effort to secure this end, a sufficient proof of their selfishness is their oppression of the lower classes, who had revolted against the Ottomans in 1572 from pure patriotism. Stefan's brother Christopher was succeeded in 1586 by his son Sigismund Báthori.

Meanwhile Maximilian had died, and the inheritance fell to his son Rudolf (1576-1608). Hungary was devastated under his rule by a Turkish war, which lasted fifteen years (1591-1606), while Transylvania was ravaged both by the Turks and by the armies of Rudolf. Sigismund Báthori, who had married Marie Christine

of Styria in 1595, soon divorced her, and exchanged his land for Oppeln and Ratibor in 1597. In 1598, however, he regretted his action. He returned home, abdicated in 1599 in favour of his nephew Andreas, and retired to Poland. Rudolf, who would have been glad to get Transylvania under his own power, incited Michael, the Voivode of Wallachia, to make war against Andreas Báthori, who fell in that campaign. The nobles then recalled Sigismund Báthori in 1601; but he was driven out, in 1602, by George Basta, the field-marshal of Rudolf,

with the help of the Turks. With the object of definitely getting the country into the possession of Rudolf, Basta had secured the murder of the Wallachian voivode in Thorenburg, or Torda, on August 19th, 1601, and exercised so inhuman a despotism as governor, that Transylvania was brought to the lowest point of distress. In exasperation and despair the nobles, after the suppression of a revolt begun by Moses Székely in 1603, appointed the Calvinist Stefan Bocskay as prince in 1605, and he soon occupied almost the whole country, with the help of the Turks. Although the sultan recognised him as



THE FAMOUS CROWN OF HUNGARY

Among the historic crowns of Europe none has had a more varied history than that of Hungary, known as the crown of St. Stefan, the lower part of it having been given by Pope Silvester II. to King Stefan. Fifty kings have been crowned with it during a period of 800 years.

The Peace of Vienna Concluded

nobles, after the suppression of a revolt begun by Moses Székely in 1603, appointed the Calvinist Stefan Bocskay as prince in 1605, and he soon occupied almost the whole country, with the help of the Turks. Although the sultan recognised him as

THE HAPSBURG POWER IN HUNGARY

king, Bocskay brought about a reconciliation with Rudolf, and concluded the peace of Vienna in June 1606, with Rudolf's brother Matthias, who had been appointed governor in Hungary; in accordance with this agreement the constitution was to be restored in its old form, and the Protestants were to retain their religious freedom undisturbed by the untenable edicts which Rudolf had issued on this subject in 1604.

After November of the same year the intervention of Bocskay brought about the peace of Zsitva-Torok with the Turks. The Turks retained the districts which they possessed at that time, but Hungary was no longer to pay tribute after one final instalment of 200,000 florins. Bocskay survived the conclusion of the peace of Vienna only for a short time; he died on December 29th, 1606. This arrangement, "without prejudice to

appearance of Luther, performed a remarkable service in fostering the spirit of union. During the piteous strife of contrary interests it spread so rapidly in the course of a century that it overran almost the whole nation. In the stern theology of Calvin,

which the nation called the "Hungarian Faith," the people found the support which saved them from collapse. "From the time of the introduction of Christianity," says the Hungarian writer on æsthetics, Zoltán Beöthy, "the Protestant movement was the first great enlightening influence which passed over the whole nation. The apostles of the new faith appeared in hundreds, the messengers of a more penetrating and more national culture." The Protestants founded numerous schools and printing-presses, which published the first Magyar grammars, dictionaries and histories. To this period belong the whole series



JOHN ZÁPOLYA KING OF HUNGARY
Zápolya was chosen king by the nobles in 1526, but was ousted by the King of Bohemia. In 1529, however, with the aid of Suleiman, the Turk, he restored himself, and held the throne until his death.



QUEEN ISABELLA

Isabella was the wife of John Zápolya and mother of King John Sigismund, and died at the hands of the Turks at Szigetvar in 1566.



NIKOLAUS ZRINYI

Zrinyi was a Magyar leader who met Bathori exchanged the throne of Transylvania for Poland.



STEFAN BATHORI

the Catholics," far from bringing the wars of religion to an end, rather tended to exasperate partisan feeling.

In these difficult times of degeneration, Protestantism, which had made an entry into Hungary immediately after the

of translations of the Bible, among which that by Kaspar Károlyi obtained a reputation which has remained undiminished from that period right up to the present day. In the course of this intellectual movement, there appeared in 1565, a year after

HARMSWORTH HISTORY OF THE WORLD

the birth of Shakespeare, the first dramatic production of Hungarian literature, under the title of "The Treachery of Melchior Balassa," probably composed by Paul Karádi, which, with biting satire and poetic vigour, described the life of a noble given over to the sins of that age. Literature was circulated through the country not only by the clergy, but also by wandering minstrels, who passed from castle to castle, and from place to place, and sang their songs to the accompaniment of the lute or violin. Of them, the most highly

Reformation. A Protestant who had been converted by the Jesuits, Peter Pázmány (1570-1637), Archbishop of Gran from 1616 and Cardinal from 1629, was a zealot in the cause of conversion, and was specially successful among the high nobility. By his sermons and pamphlets, which he collected in his "Kalauz," or "Hodegeus" ("guide"), as his great work was called, he converted many nobles to the Roman Catholic faith. In 1635 he refounded the Jesuit University at Tyrnau, which was burnt down in the sixteenth century; this



THE DESTRUCTION OF SZIGETVÁR BY THE TURKS ON SEPTEMBER 7th, 1606
This picture of the assault in which Nikolaus Zrinyi was killed is taken from a woodcut of the period.

educated was, perhaps, Sebastian Tinódi (about 1510-1557), whose historical songs and rhymed chronicle recount the whole history of those years of warfare and distress. The heroic and careless-minded knight, Valentin Balassy (1551-1594), was the first great Hungarian lyric poet whose "Blumenlieder" were to be revived two centuries later. Romantic poetry at that time entered upon a peculiar period of prosperity in Hungary. Under Rudolf's successor, Matthias, whose reign lasted from 1608 till 1619, began the Catholic Counter-

was afterwards changed into the High School of Budapesth. The Reformation in Hungary seemed doomed to collapse.

Only in Transylvania was Protestantism strong enough at this period to check the progress of the Counter-Reformation and to protect the Protestants who were persecuted in Hungary. When the Thirty Years' War broke out under Ferdinand II. (1619-1637), the successor of Matthias, the throne of Transylvania was occupied by Gabriel Bethlen (1613-1629), the successor to Gabriel Báthori (1608-1613); to

THE HAPSBURG POWER IN HUNGARY

him Protestantism in Hungary and Transylvania is indebted for its preservation.

When the Bohemians revolted against Ferdinand II. in 1619, Bethlen espoused their cause, and brought the greater part of Hungary, including the crown, into his power. On January 8th, 1620, he was appointed king in Neusohl, and was also recognised by the Porte at the price of the sacrifice of Waitzen on November 5th, 1621. However, on January 6th, 1622, he concluded peace with Ferdinand II. at Nikolsburg, for the power of the Hapsburgs had increased considerably since the battle of the White Mountain.

Soon, however, he again took up arms against Ferdinand, as the ally of the German Protestant princes. He was induced by the victory of Tilly over the allies of the "Winter King" to renew the peace on the 8th of May, 1624, and was even desirous of marrying a daughter of Ferdinand, in order to unite his power with that of the Hapsburgs against the Turks. Catholic influence prevented this project, and Bethlen married Katharina, a sister of the Elector George William of Brandenburg. In the year 1626 he advanced for the third time against the brave Mansfeld; as, however, King Christian IV. of Denmark was also defeated by Tilly, he finally concluded peace with Ferdinand on December 28th, at Pressburg. After a reign of fifteen years, he died without children on November 15th, 1629; he was the greatest prince of Transylvania, and largely forwarded the progress of culture, science and education.

After Stefan Bethlen had made an unsuccessful attempt at the regency, the Transylvanians chose as their prince

George Rakoczy I. (1631-1648), a son of that Sigismund Rakoczy who had been prince of Transylvania from February, 1607, to March 3rd, 1608. After a series of difficulties at home and abroad he was forced to take up arms against King Ferdinand III. (1637-1657), in the interest of Hungarian Protestantism. In September, 1645, the contending parties concluded peace at Linz, and a full measure of religious toleration was secured to the Protestants; this agreement was an advance upon that of Nikolsburg, in so far as the concessions formerly made to the nobility were now extended to the citizens and serfs.

Rakoczy died on the day of the proclamation of the Peace of Westphalia, and was succeeded by his son George Rakoczy II. (1648-1658). In 1653 he secured the supremacy of Moldavia, and that of Wallachia in 1654, after the death of Matthias Basarab, as Constantine Basarab then submitted to him. On the other hand, he wasted his strength in 1657 in a fruitless war against Poland as the ally of Charles X. of Sweden. He was consequently deposed by the Turks, and died on June 6th, 1660, of the wounds he had

received at Szamosfalva on the 22nd of May. The Grand Vizir placed Franz Rhédey on the throne in November, 1657, and, upon his speedy abdication, installed Achatius Bárcsay in November, 1658. The latter, however, was expelled by John Kemény. Against him the Vizir Ali set up an op-

position prince on September 14th, 1661, in the person of Michael Apafi (1661-1690). After a rule of one year Kemény fell, on January 24th, 1662, at Nagy-Szöllös, near Schässburg. As Transylvania grew weaker, Hungarian Protestantism was hard beset



KING FERDINAND II.

This Hapsburg ruler of Bohemia and Hungary had to meet a revolt of Bohemia in 1619; and Gabriel Bethlen, joining with the Bohemians, secured part of Hungary.



GABRIEL BETHLEN

Though Bethlen, King of Transylvania, succeeded against Ferdinand, with the aid of Bohemia, he was, later, glad to make friends with the Hapsburgs. George Rakoczy II. ruled Transylvania from 1648 till 1658.



GEORGE RAKOCZY II.

from day to day, and at the same time the Turks were extending their conquests and occupying the most important fortresses in Upper Hungary and in the Austrian territories. Under the son and successor of Ferdinand III., the strict Catholic, Leopold I. (1658-1705), the distress of the country began to reach its

A Literary Hungarian Protestant

zenith. In those troubled times the greatest figure of Hungarian Protestantism was Albert Szenczi Molnár, who wrote his Hungarian Grammar and Dictionary at German universities, and translated psalms, which he set to French tunes, a setting used at the present day in the Calvinistic Churches of Hungary. In the battles of that year a conspicuous figure is Nikolaus Zrinyi (1616-1664), a great-grandson of the hero of Szigetvar; he composed an epic poem, "The Peril of Sziget," in which he sang the exploits of his great ancestor, whose military capacity had long hindered the progress of the Ottomans. Leopold's field-marshal, Raimondo Montecuccoli, won a victory over the Turks on August 1st, 1664, at St. Gothard on the Raab; but, in consequence of the danger threatened to his rear by the Magyars, concluded a peace at Eisenburg, by the terms of which the Turks retained possession of all their previous conquests.

This disgraceful retreat stirred up exasperation in Hungary, and a conspiracy was set on foot in 1667; the leaders, however, who reckoned on French and Turkish support, the Counts Peter Zrinyi, Franz Nádasdy, and Franz Christopher Frangepani were executed on April 30th, 1671. Franz Rakoczy, the son-in-law of Zrinyi, was spared, while Franz of Wesselényi died a natural death on March 28th, 1667, before the discovery of the conspiracy. The Vienna government took advantage of this occasion to overthrow the constitution and to extirpate Protestantism. The property of Protestant nobles was confiscated, priests and teachers were transported in bands and served in the galleys of Naples, while executions and condemnations were of daily occurrence. Thousands fled to Transylvania and to

the Turkish frontier districts, whence, under the name of Kurutzen or Crusaders, they continually made incursions into the royal domains. These struggles, however, with the mercenaries of the foreign government did not become important until 1678, when Emerich Tokoly placed himself at the head of the movement. With the exception of some few castles the whole of the royal district fell into the hands of Tokoly, who was appointed Prince of Hungary by the sultan, and chosen king in 1682 by the diet of Kaschau, an election confirmed by the Porte on August 10th, 1683. The defeat of Vienna brought his rule to a speedy end, and Leopold now sent his armies into Hungary in conjunction with his German allies. On September 2nd, 1686, the citadel of Ofen again fell into the hands of the Christians after one hundred and



EMERICH TOKOLY

Who headed the movement against Hungary in 1678 and was appointed Prince of Hungary by the sultan in 1682; his spell of power was short.

forty-five years of Turkish rule. The grateful nobles abolished the elective monarchy in 1687, and recognised the hereditary rights of the house of Hapsburg by primogeniture in the male line.

The Turks lost one district after another; and when Prince Eugene of Savoy had inflicted a fearful defeat upon them at Zenta, on September 11th, 1697, the Peace of Karlovitz was concluded, by the terms of which Hungary was freed from the Turkish yoke with the exception of the valley of the Temes and part of Syrmia. Transylvania had been so

closely conjoined with Hungary, on May 10th, 1688, that Apafi now possessed only a shadow of his former power. However, the persecution of the Protestants and the oppression of the people still continued. Leopold's generals, including Antonio Caraffa, who had secured Transylvania

Hungary Free From the Turkish Yoke

for the Hapsburgs, after the death of the prince Apafi in 1690, exercised so inhuman a despotism, that the general exasperation broke out again in 1703. Franz Rakoczy II. (1676-1735), a son of the above-mentioned Franz I., took the lead of the malcontents. At that time Leopold was occupied with the War of the Spanish Succession, and almost the whole country fell into the hands of the nobles, and was declared independent on June 7th.



THE RECAPTURE OF THE CITADEL OF OFEN BY THE CHRISTIANS IN 1686

For nearly a century and a half the citadel of Ofen, which is the modern Buda, had been held by the Turks, and was an important centre of the Ottoman power in the west. But after the defeat of Vienna, Leopold I, who was a strict and zealous Catholic, sent his armies into Hungary in conjunction with his German allies, and on September 2nd, 1686, Ofen was rescued from the dominion of the Turk. In the following year the grateful nobles abolished the elective monarchy which had hitherto obtained, and the House of Hapsburg was established on the throne of Hungary.

After the death of Leopold, his son Joseph I. (1705-1711) undertook the government; and the nobles then declared at the diet of Onod, in 1707, that the throne had passed from the Hapsburgs. An appeal to arms resulted in Joseph's favour in 1708. Rakoczy fled, and his field-marshal Karolyi concluded peace with the king at Szatmar on May 1st, 1711. With this peace the

Hungary's Debt to Protestantism

momentous period of internal struggle, for which the high nobility were chiefly to blame, came to an end.

The fact that the Hungarian nation was not destroyed in the severe struggles of those years, but was able to preserve its national independence, was owing primarily to Protestantism, which preserved

custom of buying and carrying off women in the modern Hungarian ceremonies of wooing and marriage; on the other hand, the peculiar funeral customs of Hungary have been considerably modified by Christian beliefs.

Tenaciously clinging to these traditions, the nation watched the One Hundred Years' War, which was carried on by those of their number who had been exasperated beyond bounds by the arbitrary rule and the religious persecution which their king had directed from Vienna. The war is, as it were, an epitome of the national history; the splendour and the sorrow of this period is reflected in a rich and brilliant ballad poetry, which was inspired in particular by the revolts of Tokoly and Rakoczy. From the events of his own

time Stefan Gyongyosi (1640-1704) found material for those narrative poems which remained popular among the nation for over a century. Shortly after Descartes, John Apaczai Cseri, who had been educated in the Netherlands, came forward, between 1654 and 1655, as the representative of rationalism, with his "Hungarian Encyclopædia." By this work he created a Magyar vocabulary for philosophy some fifty years before Chr. Thomasius had done the same for German. At the same time there were a number of historians and

chroniclers, such as John Szalardi, Prince John Kemeny, Nikolaus Bethlen (1642-1716), Michael Cserei (1668-1756), and also the narrator of ancient customs, Peter Apor (1676-1752). The most distinguished work in the literature of that time is certainly the "Letters from Turkey" of Klemens Mikes (1690-1762), who shared the banishment to Turkey of Franz Rakoczy II., and clung with moving fidelity to his defeated master and to the country he had lost.

Under the government of Charles III. (1711-1740) peace slowly began to gain ground, although the Turkish war broke out twice during his reign. After the first campaign the king not only recovered, in 1718, by the Peace of Passarowitz, the



DRESSES OF HUNGARIAN SOLDIERS IN SIXTEENTH CENTURY
From an old wood engraving in "The Triumph of King Maximilian I."

the old native conceptions derived from ancient and in part from heathen times, and indeed almost justified their right to exist side by side with new trains of thought. As the Roman Church at the introduction of Christianity interfered but little in family life and popular custom, so also Protestantism, as being in close sympathy with the idea of nationality, did its best to preserve traditional use and custom. In the midst of religious and political dissension at home and abroad, Protestantism placed national unity above religious uniformity. It was rather a conservative than a destructive force in its influence upon ancient family customs, of which many fragments have survived from that day to the present. A case in point is the survival of the old



A countess in the dress of a lady of rank



The typical national costume of a nobleman



A Hungarian baron in the dress of his rank



The Prime Minister in the costume of a noble

THE COSTUMES OF THE OLD HUNGARIAN NOBLES

From a series of photographs of present-day nobles in their national dress.

E. N. A.

3133

Turkish portion of Hungary, but also made acquisitions in Wallachia and Servia.

After the death of Charles III., his daughter Maria Theresa (1740-1780) ascended the throne, but her right to the succession was immediately and vigorously disputed. The Prussian king, Frederick II., invaded Silesia; the elector, Charles Albert of Bavaria, occupied Upper Austria and Bohemia with French help; and the Spaniards attacked the Italian possessions. At the diet of Pressburg, on September 11th, 1741, the nobles enthusiastically placed their lives and property at the disposal of the young queen. In a short time, the Hungarian and Austrian troops drove the French and Bavarians out of Bohemia and occupied Bavaria. Only Frederick II. was able to deprive the queen of some comparatively small amount of territory, as she was thrice obliged to cede to him a part of Silesia. During the years of peace the queen devoted her attention to improving the material and intellectual prosperity of her subjects, and introduced beneficial reforms into ecclesiastical and educational organisations.

While the national spirit was thus stirred to new life, literature also entered upon a remarkably flourishing period. Full of gratitude, Maria Theresa summoned the chief nobility to her court, and

formed a Hungarian bodyguard of their sons, in 1760, at Vienna, who became the pioneers of a new culture through their close connection with the intellectual movements in the West. In the year 1772 there appeared from the pen of George Bessenyei (1752-1811) "The Tragedy of Agis;" in this, as in his other dramas and in his epic poem of King

Matthias, the poet showed a masterly power of imitating the French, and especially Voltaire. He thus became the founder of the "French School," among whom Alexander Baroczi (1737-1809) and Joseph Peczeli became conspicuous as translators of French works of literature.

With the accession of the son of Maria Theresa, the humanitarian Joseph II. (1780-1790), the kings of the house of Lorraine and Tuscany came to the Hungarian throne. Joseph continued the work of reform, but without displaying his mother's tact. In 1784 he made German, instead of Latin, the official language of the state and of the schools; in 1785 he

divided the country into ten new districts, and placed foreigners at the head of these.

A dangerous ferment arose in 1789 when Charles Augustus of Saxe-Weimar was nearly set up as an opposition king with Prussian support; and Joseph II. shortly before his death on January 30th, 1790, was forced to repeal all his innovations.



FRANZ RAKOCZY II.

With whose defeat at Szatmar, in 1711, Hungarian internal strife came to an end.



THE CITADEL AND CATHEDRAL OF GRAN, THE ANCIENT CAPITAL OF HUNGARY



GERMAN ELEMENT IN HUNGARY AND ITS INFLUENCE DURING 800 YEARS

AFTER the overthrow of the rule of the Avars, the frontiers of the great Frankish dominion were occupied by German colonists; Frankish and Bavarian nobles obtained extensive possessions, especially in the mountainous country which borders the frontiers of Styria, and even then bore some traces of Roman civilisation. When the Hungarians occupied the country at the end of the ninth century, they left the German settlements for the most part undisturbed, but prevented their increase. Many of the fortified frontier strongholds may have been overthrown in the course of the Magyar attacks; but they did not disappear entirely.

Friendly relations with Germany were secured in 995 by the marriage of Stefan with Gisela, the daughter of the Bavarian duke, Henry II., for the reason that this lady brought with her many clergy and nobles and their retinues, who helped to bring about the rapid extension of Christianity and culture. The immigration of German knights, monks, and other people became more rapid after the husband of Gisela had ascended the throne of Hungary; however, among the German colonies proper we have certain information concerning only one as originating from that early period, that is, Deutsch-Szatmar on the Szamos, which was founded by Gisela herself.

The apostle-king, as Stefan I., or Saint Stefan, has been called, organised his court upon German models, and throughout his reign displayed a consistent tendency to favour the noble immigrants. In his advice to his son Emerich, who died prematurely, he wrote that the introduction of foreigners was to be regarded as a necessary means to the support of the throne and to the increase of the imperial power; "treat these guests well and hold them in honour." Upon the whole, this was the attitude adopted by his successors of the Arpad family.

The counties of Eisenburg and Odenburg on the slopes of the Leitha mountain range, at the base of which lies the Lake of Neusiedel, and also the valleys formed by the spurs of the Eastern Alps of Styria and Austria, are inhabited by the German people of the Hienzes. Upon an area of some 400 square miles are to be found

The Hienzes, 30,000 Slavs ("Water-Croatian"), 10,000 Jews, about
or "Henry's People" 5,000 Magyars, and about
300,000 Germans, for the most

part Catholics. The name Hienz, or Haenz, points to their German origin, for their neighbours would not have given this little people any name of German form. Probably the name is derived from Heinz, Henz, or Aenz (Heinrich or Henry), and consequently has the meaning "Henry's people," meaning either the Emperor Henry III. or Count Henry of Güssing (1228—1274), who founded one of the most powerful families, was for a time palatine of the empire, and is often mentioned in the frontier wars against Styria and the Austrians. He founded numerous fortresses in these districts, including the castle of Ternstein and the town of Güns. His sons, Ivan, or John, Peter, Nicholas, and Henry, all occupied high positions, and are named in the documents "Henry's sons"; they all worked to secure the prestige of their family. Almost all the fortresses on the western frontier were in their possession. The garrisons of these fortresses were exclusively German, recruited for the most part from the surrounding inhabitants, and may therefore have taken the names Hienzes, or Haenzes, or have received it from their master.

The remnants of that Bavarian settlement founded here by Charles the Great to oppose the Avars—though we need not assume that the colonial activity of Charles extended beyond the east frontier into Pannonian territory—developed into

flourishing Bavarian communities under the Frankish margraves; like these, the settlements of the Hienzes suffered no doubt considerable damage from the occupation of the country by the Hungarians, but soon received important reinforcements in the numerous German prisoners brought by the Hungarians from German countries in the course of their raids. This

**The Rich
Fruits of
Industry**

German group of communities was especially strengthened in the first place by the neighbourhood of Austria and Styria, and further by the incorporation of German nobles. The wooded frontier district, which even at the time of the Emperor Henry III. was so inhospitable that he was able to penetrate into Hungary only by following the long windings of the Raab, was transformed by the industry, the native vigour, the common-sense, and the God-fearing work of the Hienzes into a rich agricultural, timber-growing, and vine-bearing district; here these people clung tenaciously in the midst of their progress to the manners and customs of their forefathers, and preserved their nationality among a Finno-Ugrian population.

Political circumstances were almost invariably favourable to the progress of the Germans, notwithstanding the many disturbances which constantly burst over the West. In 1440, when Eisenstadt was mortgaged by Queen Elizabeth to the Austrian duke Albert, the German nationality received a strong reinforcement. With the consent of the Hungarian nobility King Matthias Corvinus ceded considerable districts to the Emperor Frederick III.

The neighbours of the Hienzes are the "Heidebauern," or heath-peasants, who lived upon the "heath" on the shores of the Lake of Neusiedel, on the Schütt, and near Pressburg. This people is of Suabian origin; they migrated from the district on the Bodensee to Hungary during the

**Turks Expelled
to Make Room
for Germans**

Reformation, to escape the persecution of the neighbouring Austrian nobles, and were protected by Maria, the consort of Lewis II., about 1626. When, however, the Counter-Reformation in Hungary prepared to suppress Protestantism by more vigorous measures after 1640, some of the heath-peasants returned to the bosom of the Catholic Church.

The neighbourhood of the Austrian territories brought with it the consequence

that the settlements of the Hienzes and of the heath-peasants took but little share in the internal disturbances or the foreign wars of the Hungarian kingdom; for that reason they were able to preserve their German nationality.

After the expulsion of the Turks, the ecclesiastical and secular nobles attempted, by bringing in German colonists, to restore the depopulated and devastated districts in the neighbourhood of the capital, on the heights of the Verthesgebirge and of the Bakonyer Wald, on the Central Danube and in the corner between the Danube and the Drave. At the end of the seventeenth century the Archbishops of Gran settled Suabians and Franks upon their property. In 1690, in the county of Pesth, Suabian immigrants founded the town of Izsaszeg, and six years later restored the ruins of Duna-Haraszti. The Duke Charles of Lorraine and Prince Eugene also settled Germans on their property at Ofen; their example was followed by the Counts Zichy, Raday, and Grassalkovich. In the year 1718 Germans from

**Secret of
German
Success**

the Rhine districts were settled on the property of the lords in the counties of Tolna and Baranya. The Austrian field-m Marshals, who had been rewarded with extensive lands in Hungary after the expulsion of the Turks, attempted to attract German colonists thither. In the majority of such settlements the German nationality has survived to the present day, though weakened in many respects.

Of much greater, and sometimes of decisive political importance, have been the Germans in Northern Hungary. Belonging for the most part to the population of Lower Saxony and Central Germany—Thüringen and Silesia—they reached their present home, between the last third of the twelfth century and the middle of the thirteenth, in the course of several advances to the slopes of the Carpathians. Their main calling was mining, but they owed much of their prosperity to their commercial activity and their manufacturing industry; and they received grants of municipal privileges through which they were enabled to produce a prosperous burgher class. Beginning with the district of the heath-peasants, whose representatives in Germany sent a few offshoots over the Danube, their central point was Pressburg, which the Hapsburgs

THE GERMAN ELEMENT IN HUNGARY

made, from 1642, the town for the coronation of the Hungarian kings and the seat of the assembly. Most of these advance posts have been absorbed, with a few scanty exceptions, by the surrounding Slovak-Ruthenian population.

The most northern points of the German nationality were formerly the mining towns of "Lower Hungary." The first Germans may have settled here at the same date when others occupied Zips in the second half of the twelfth century. The oldest mining colony, Schemnitz, received corporate privileges from Béla IV. as early as 1244. The "municipal and mining code of Schemnitz," composed in two sections on the basis of that royal document in the thirteenth century by the "sworn representatives of the town," detailed in forty sections the "town rights" and in twenty the "mining rights," and was, in the course of the fourteenth century, extended to include most of the remaining mining towns, so far as they had not already charters of their own.

In 1255 the men of Neusohl acquired the right to carry on mining free of taxation; their only obligation was to pay a tenth part of the gold and an eighth of the silver to the royal treasury, and to serve under the king's flag in campaigns. They, too, were allowed the ordeal of battle, after the old Saxon custom, with swords and round shields. It was, however, King Stefan V. who first gave Neusohl its charter of freedom in the year 1271. Kremnitz, which had been the seat of the imperial chamberlain from 1323, was given rights hitherto enjoyed only by the rich Kuttensburg in Bohemia, by King Charles Robert, with the consent of the secular and ecclesiastical nobles. Thus the people of Kremnitz were able to live under judges of their own choice, and could be prosecuted for debt by none in the whole country.

In 1424, when King Sigismund handed over the mountain towns to his second wife, Barbara of Cilli, who died in 1451, the result was that they remained a coherent group in the possession of the Hungarian queen, and received extensive privileges enabling them to attain a prosperity which aroused the envy and the avarice of the lords of neighbouring castles. The castles which surrounded that district in a circle

were partly in possession of the Hussite leader Giskra, and partly in that of the family of Doczy and of other nobles. In 1497 the quarrel broke out, but soon ended in a compromise. Meanwhile the mining towns enjoyed the favour of the powerful families of Thurzo and Fugger, with whose support they were able to emerge victoriously from the struggle.

The Richest Man in Hungary

Towards the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries the mining towns attained the zenith of their prosperity, notwithstanding the attacks of the Turks and the devastations of hostile armies. Their export copper trade extended beyond Cracow to Danzig and the Hansa towns, even to Antwerp and Venice. The lessee of the mines of Neusohl, Alexius Thurzo, chancellor of the imperial exchequer, was regarded in 1523 as "the richest man in Hungary," while his relations in Augsburg, the Fuggers, were for a long time bankers of the Hungarian kings.

The disturbances of the seventeenth century brought grievous consequences upon the mining towns. In 1620 Gabriel Bethlen caused himself to be proclaimed King of Hungary in Neusohl, and from 1619 the mining towns were forced to pay him heavy taxes. During the disturbances in the time of Rakoczy and Tokoly, these towns were not only the scene of warfare, but also lost their prosperity in consequence of extortions and devastation. Towards the end of the seventeenth century the mines became less productive, for natural reasons. As an additional calamity came the persecutions of the Counter-Reformation, to which members of the Lutheran doctrine were exposed. The impoverished mining towns were now occupied by Slovaks and here and there by Magyars. The nobility seized the greater part of the mines. A century, however, was needed to reduce the German

German Nationality in Ruins

nationality in this place to its present low ebb; to-day only family names and place names are German, the population is Slovak. Passing over the ruins of German nationality in the north-west, we come to the extreme north of Hungary to the southern slopes of the Carpathians, where we find the vigorous German tribe of the people of Zips, who since the seventh century have had a settled home amid the romantic surroundings of the high

mountain range, and by their steady industry have secured prosperity and reputation among the neighbouring peoples. The wealth of timber, the number of mountain streams, and the nature of the natural products of the "Silva zepus" (in Magyar Szepes) limited the agricultural possibilities of the place, and naturally turned the inhabitants to industrial occupations. Thus the inhabitant of Zips became a workman; "his log huts, originally scattered about, gradually drew closer together, and from this uncouth nucleus developed the towering town."

The Stormy Times of Geza II.

The first definite occupation of Zips by the Germans probably falls in the stormy period of Geza II., who was in alliance with the Welf duke, Henry the Lion. Tradition speaks of the Count Reinold, who was the king's chief justice, and led his brother compatriots into this district about 1150. A contemporary Byzantine writer, Johannes Kinnamos, speaks of an army of Czechs and Saxons which was gathered by Geza in 1156, for a war against Constantinople. It was not until the end of the twelfth century, under Bela III., that the main reinforcement reached Zips; this was drawn chiefly from Central Germany, especially from Silesia. The modern dialect of Zips is allied to that of Silesia.

At the beginning of the thirteenth century individual stragglers followed, after Gertrude of Andechs-Meran, the first wife of Andreas II., had conferred property in Zips on several Tyrolese noble families; from their leader, Rüdiger of Deutsch-Matrei, the Berzeviczy derived their descent. The oppressive rule of the nobility of German extraction seems even then to have become so highly unpopular that in 1213 the national Magyar party began a bloody revolt against the queen regent, who favoured the Germans. After the invasion of the Mongols, which divides the history of Zips, like that of so many other districts, into two stages, a large influx of immigrants appeared in the fourteenth century, chiefly from Silesia and Thuringia.

Magyars in Revolt

In a short time the German places in this remote mountain district became so prosperous that the society of the clergy of Zips, founded about 1232 under their provost, and known after 1248 as a "sodalitate," or "confraternity,"

arranged the secular or ecclesiastical affairs of the country. In 1274 Ladislaus IV. confirmed the rights of this society; in 1297 Andreas III. also gave it the right to collect tithes. Before 1271 Stefan V. had given his "faithful Saxons of Zips" a "privilegium" as a guarantee of their "independence." Thereafter these "royal places" had to pay three hundred marks of silver every year, in return for which they were free of all other contributions, and in time of war had to place fifty armed men beneath the king's banner. They were allowed to choose their own count, who governed them according to their rights, and also their clergy. Hunting, fishing, and mining rights were also recognised in their charters.

After the death of the last Arpad in 1301, under the leadership of the soldier Matthæus of Esak, of the mountain fortress of Trentschin, the nobility of the Waag district attempted a revolt. The people of Zips, who had formerly done homage to Wenzel and Otto, now joined the Angevin Charles Robert, who with their help decisively defeated the west Hungarian nobility at Rozgony, in the valley of the Tarcza, in 1312. In recognition of the services which they had "willingly done him since his youth," and for their "manly and faithful struggle against Matthæus of Trentschin, in which they spared neither person nor purse," Charles Robert, in 1318, confirmed the privileges of the twenty-four royal towns.

On the basis of this charter the chiefs, representatives, and elders, in 1370, drew up an important legal code, the "arbitrium"—that is, free choice or convention—of the Saxons in Zips; this was recognised in the same year by King Lewis, and thus became law. Ecclesiasticism, a love of discipline, a strong sense of honesty, are the most striking features of this code. Manufactures at this flourishing period were controlled by guilds and associations. Trade and industry began to develop in the towns and plains. Numerous foreigners lived here all the year round, for the reason that a vigorous commercial intercourse went on between this place and Poland and Silesia.

Exactly 100 years after the confirmation of the privileges by Charles Robert, the first heavy blow fell upon Zips. On November 8th, 1412, the Emperor-king



HUNGARIAN VILLAGE IN THE CARPATHIAN MOUNTAINS



PRESSBURG, THE ANCIENT CAPITAL OF UPPER HUNGARY



A VALLEY OF THE EAST STYRIAN ALPS IN THE LEITHE MOUNTAINS

IN THE LAND OF THE MAGYARS: TYPICAL SCENES IN HUNGARY

Sigismund I., who was in a constant state of financial embarrassment, mortgaged the thirteen settlements of Zips, together with the royal fiefs of Lublau, Pudlein, and Gnesen, to Vladislav of Poland. The alliance of the towns of Zips was continued for a time even after their alienation. They were handed over to Polish officials,

The Doom of the Germans who soon began to exercise an arbitrary authority in the mortgaged district and made it an hereditary starosty. At the instance of the Hungarian Diet, Vladislav III. promised to give back the country in 1440, but in the agreement of Altenburg between Hungary and Poland the mortgage was renewed in 1474. This agreement sealed the doom of the German nationality in the northern districts and in part of the southern.

Further damage was inflicted by the intrusion of the Hussites and the supremacy of Bohemian mercenaries under Giskra. Political independence disappeared; towns that remained Hungarian were deserted, and were handed over by the king to the noble families. Thus King Matthias conferred upon his faithful Emerich Zapolya the hereditary county of Zips, and also, in 1480, the possession of the town of Kasmark, which had been made a royal free town, together with the nine parishes attached to it. In 1655 Kasmark alone had been able to resist the intrusion of the Magyar nobility and of the Slavs, and secured recognition as a free town.

In the course of these distresses the Germans of Zips would in no long time have suffered an invasion of foreign nationalities had not the German element in Upper Hungary been strengthened by the Reformation with its German preaching and its German hymns. The close connection with Germany, in the high schools of which several pupils from Zips studied the sciences every year, brought

Friends and Foes of the Reformation with it the consequence that men like Martin Cziriak, a pupil of Melan-chthon, Thomas Preisner, and George Leutscher boldly and successfully fought against the Catholic clergy. The Reformation was carried out, therefore, in 1546 throughout the country of Zips notwithstanding the decrees of 1523 and 1525, in which it was declared that "all Lutherans with their supporters and adherents would be regarded as open

heretics and enemies of the sacred Virgin Mary, and would be punished by execution and confiscation of their property."

On the 26th of October, 1546, the entire clergy of Zips publicly acknowledged the Lutheran creed. The intellectual revival brought with it fresh development of trade and manufacture. The linen and cloth fabrics of Zips, and the leather and metal work of the country, were famous far and wide on the North Sea and the Baltic, in the midst of Russia and in Constantinople. At Whitsuntide, Greeks, Russians, and Serbs, even North Germans, were in the habit of visiting the country to make their purchases. The inhabitants were an enterprising and energetic little people, who kept in touch with the mother country in their new mountain home and created a civilisation which raised the citizens and the peasants of the time to a height of prosperity and intelligence unusual in Hungary.

Soon, however, this revival of German science and art was exposed to severe attacks. In 1588 opposition to the new faith began at the instigation of Martin Pethe, the provost of Zips, and in 1604 the opposition developed into a vigorous counter-reformation. The government Catholic commissioners appeared in Zips and attempted to force the inhabitants to surrender their churches to the Catholics; but the people rose in revolt and drove out the commissioners. The disturbances under Stefan Bocskay and the peace of Vienna of 1606 put an end for some time to the persecution of the Protestants in Zips.

But in 1632 the Jesuits, in conjunction with the Magyar Catholic nobles and with the military and civil authorities, began again the work of forcible conversion. The Protestant clergy lost their property and were driven out of the country; their churches were taken from them by the soldiers and handed over to the Catholics. This work was continued by a process of forcibly denationalising the towns and parishes and by electing Magyar nobles as councillors and judges. Notwithstanding the vigorous support which they gave to all those political risings which took place in the interests of the new creed, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, under Bocskay, Bethlen, Tokoly, and Franz Rakoczy, the Germans of Zips had

THE GERMAN ELEMENT IN HUNGARY

to suffer the hardest treatment from their own allies. Devastation, persecution, and oppression of every kind produced the result that the Germans grew steadily weaker through the advance of the Hungarians and of the productive, adaptable and capable Slovaks.

Notwithstanding the depth of this overthrow, wherever a hand's-breadth of favourable soil was to be found, the irrepressible vigour of the inhabitants brought forth new results. German industry and economy survived the worst disasters, and eventually succeeded in producing a feeble similitude of former prosperity. Among the free towns, industrial and commercial life continued to flourish. The German language was predominant notwithstanding the prevalence of Magyar, Slav, and Low Latin, and was the medium of constant communication with foreign countries. The feeling of German nationality was, however, terribly shattered.

In 1772 thirteen places mortgaged to Poland were reunited with Hungary, and "the sixteen towns of Zips" were placed under a special Count, as judge and supreme administrative official; the Empress-queen Maria Theresa not only confirmed the previous privileges, but added new rights in 1775.

It is an indisputable fact that wherever the German nationality in Hungary has devoted itself to trade and manufacture the lapse of time has brought annihilation, in spite of the prosperity and culture acquired, whereas the communities especially devoted to agriculture and cattle-breeding have been able to maintain their position to the present day.

The home of the Transylvanian Saxons is encircled and traversed by the Carpathians, with their snow-clad summits white under the midsummer sun, with their wooded valleys full of flowers, birds, and animals, with their rushing brooks and streams. Here, more than seven centuries ago, the Germans found the counterpart of their earlier home, and here they settled. Many a storm burst over this peaceful centre of German civilisation; but intervals of rest continually recurred during which this offshoot of the parent stock put forth new growth.

The chief settlements of the Germans in Transylvania were made under Geza II. for the protection of the south-east

frontier of the empire against the Cumans, who had established themselves in Moldavia and Wallachia after the subjugation of the Pechenegs, and made constant incursions into the neighbouring provinces. These immigrants came partly from the Lower Rhine, partly from Flanders, and are designated as "Teutons from beyond the forest;" they are also known as "Flemings."

Kronstadt becomes the Capital The title "Saxons," or Saxones, which afterwards became universal, does not appear before 1206. Their settlements extended along the banks of the Alt to its confluence with the Homorod, and from the Maros to the valley of the Kokel River. The proximity of savage tribes forced the settlers to build fortified churches and castles where the inhabitants of the plain could take refuge in time of need. In course of time these strongholds developed into towns and places of greater size. A favourite point of entrance for marauding bands was upon the extreme south of the Burzen district; for this reason Andreas II. allowed the Teutonic Order to build stockades and towns here in 1211; Kronstadt then became the capital. The Order was, however, forbidden to populate the district of Burzen with Saxons from the neighbouring provinces, and new settlers were brought in.

After the expulsion of the German knights, which took place in 1225, in spite of the vigorous support accorded to them by Pope Honorius III., Kronstadt soon became prosperous and exercised a kind of hegemony over the other colonies; the town is first mentioned in a document of 1252. The German colonies in the district of Nösen seem to be of earlier date; in 1264 Bistritz seems to have been in existence for some time. These north-eastern Transylvanians, like those of Deés, probably came from other parts of Hungary, and settled here to carry on the mining industry. The chief places, which were under their own counts in 1300, together with their surrounding districts, formed the private property of the Hungarian queens from an early date; thus on July 16th, 1264, Pope Urban IV. orders the king's son Stefan (V.) to restore the towns of Bistritz, Rodna, Senndorf, and Baierdorf which he had unjustly taken from his mother, Maria. On December 29th, 1330, the

"citizens and colonists of Bistritz and those belonging to that jurisdiction" received a charter from Queen Elizabeth, with the consent of her husband Charles, by the terms of which they were placed exclusively under the jurisdiction of judges elected by themselves. In a short time the German settlements rose to

German a prosperity and political
Prestige at its importance which secured
Highest them the favour of the Hungarian kings. Thus, about 1185, Béla II. was able to report to Paris, upon the occasion of his betrothal, the receipt of 15,000 marks from the foreign settlers of the king in Transylvania. The rapidity with which the prestige of the Germans increased and the height to which it rose is evidenced by the "Andreanum" of the close of 1224; in this edict Andreas II. confirmed and increased all the privileges granted to the Germans from Broos to Draas, near Neps, upon their immigration; he united the independent districts of the settlers brought in by Geza II. into one province governed by an elected "count" as supreme judge who resided in Hermannstadt.

The progress of prosperity was, however, soon checked by the Mongol invasions of 1240-1242. The fortified towns and strongholds of the country could provide refuge for comparatively few. The majority fled to the mountains, where they perished. Under the fostering care of the kings the German settlements recovered comparatively quickly after the retreat of the Mongols. Such new settlements as Klausenburg were also founded by Stefan V., before 1270, as Duke of Transylvania; for the benefit of his soul he conferred this fief upon the Church of Weissenburg. As Hungarian nobles were not allowed to settle upon Saxon soil, and as the Germans of that district enjoyed the rights of nobles, the last of the Arpads, Andreas III.,

From summoned them to partici-
Wilderness pation in the Hungarian diet
to Garden in July, 1292, and in August, 1298. In 150 years the "Saxons" had cleared and completely transformed the former wilderness. About 300 strongholds, forts, and fortified churches protected the goods and chattels of freemen, and guaranteed the security of this once doubtful Hungarian possession. The swamps were drained and became fruitful, arable land. Upon the mountains and in

the lonely valleys, in the fertile lowlands of the Kokel River, and where the stony slopes of the Carpathians bring forth a scanty harvest, dwelt a people whose industrial and agricultural labours and peaceful devotion to the arts had created a flourishing country while their representatives sat in the diet side by side with the barons and prelates of the empire.

When the house of Arpad became extinct in 1301, hard times began for the Saxons of Transylvania. Like all the Germans in Hungary, they had joined Otto, the duke of Lower Bavaria; he accepted their well-meant invitation, fell into the hands of the treacherous voivode Ladislaus, or Apor, and was soon forced to leave the country. The Saxons were then exposed to the oppression of the Bishop of Weissenburg, and the powerful voivode deprived them of the rich silver mines of Rodna. In 1324 they were forced to take up arms in defence of their rights of 1224, which had been again secured to them on May 25th, 1317, by Charles Robert, who had become sole ruler in the meantime. This period of oppression was followed

Hard Times by a time of prosperity under
for the the government of Lewis I.,
Saxons who favoured Saxon trade in every possible way. From 1369, Kronstadt possessed staple privileges against Polish, German, and other foreign merchants, especially cloth merchants. The fairs in Germany and Poland were visited by bands of Saxons. The trade route led to Germany through Prague, and passed to the south-west through the Danube territories to Dalmatia and Venice. Numerous schools and churches, monasteries and hospitals, were founded, and the citizen guilds, brotherhoods, and trainbands were admirably organised.

After the death of Lewis the great troubles again began. Under Sigismund (1387-1437) internal disturbances broke out, in the course of which the neighbourhood of Klausenburg was devastated by the king's opponents. But the greatest danger menacing Transylvania was the advance of the Turks. In 1420 they destroyed the old "Saxon town" of Broos, and carried the inhabitants away to slavery; in the next year they overwhelmed Kronstadt. Previous to and during their invasions the first gipsies entered the country. In Hungary the struggles of the Magyar nobles with the German citizens were beginning, and at

THE GERMAN ELEMENT IN HUNGARY

this time the three hard-pressed "peoples" of Transylvania, the Hungarians, the old Magyar Szeklers, and the Saxons, concluded the "Union" at Kapolna on September 28th, 1427, and swore "to protect one another against all and sundry who should attack them; only, if the king should infringe the rights of one of the contracting peoples, the other two should appear before him on bended knees and ask his favour. For the rest, upon the second day following an appeal for help, the parties should start with all their forces to give aid as quickly as possible and should march at least twelve miles daily."

In the year 1438 the Turks destroyed the town of Mühlbach and captured some 75,000 slaves, after fruitlessly besieging Hermannstadt for forty-five days. On November 10th, 1444, the banner of the Saxons waved over the battlefield of Varna, and in October, 1448, they fought against the hereditary enemy on the Anselfeld under John Hunyadi. But the domestic life of the German settlers was shattered by these military disturbances. Klausenburg and Winz soon received a Magyar influx of population, which speedily became predominant and broke off connection with the other Saxon districts. On the accession of Matthias Hunyadi, the Hungarians, Szeklers, and Saxons renewed the alliance of Kapolna at Mediasch in 1459, with a view to resisting any possible attacks of the king. The revolt was stifled by the rapidity of his movements. To these internal disturbances were added the invasions of the Turks, who continually renewed their harassing incursions, even after their defeat on the Brotfeld in October 13th, 1479. King Matthias recognised the services of the Saxons and increased their territory.

Notwithstanding the troubles of the age, their close and profitable intercourse with the mother country had enabled the Saxons to surpass every other nationality within the empire in respect of culture. Every year several Saxon youths went as students to the German high schools at Wittenberg, Jena, and Tübingen, and brought back a knowledge of science and art for the benefit of their own country. By these channels of intercourse the great ecclesiastical Reformation of the sixteenth century reached the Saxon colonies and

rapidly secured the general support. In 1519 Saxon merchants brought Luther's writings from the fair of Leipsic; in 1521-1522 the first evangelical preachers, the Silesian Ambrosius and Conrad Weich, appeared in Hermannstadt. The energy of a pupil of Melanchthon, the Saxon preacher Johannes Honter (1498-1549),

**Transylvania
and Hungary
Break Apart**

who brought a printing-press with him, secured the success of the Reformation in Transylvania in 1547. The

struggle for the throne between Zápolya and Ferdinand I. cost the Saxons heavily in life and property. After the death of Zápolya Suleiman II., who claimed the suzerainty of Transylvania, conferred the country upon Johann Sigismund Zápolya, who was then in his minority. His authority was limited to the district on the further side of the Theiss, and the period of the separation of Transylvania from Hungary then begins, to last for 150 years. For a short time Transylvania came into the power of King Ferdinand, but after the death of Johann Sigismund in 1571 the sultan transferred it to Stefan Báthori, who brought in the Jesuits. In December, 1575, he was elected King of Poland, and then handed over Transylvania to his brother Christopher, who also seconded the efforts of the Jesuits to bring the country back to Roman Catholicism.

At that time the Saxons were exposed to extortion of every kind. They found a supporter in Stefan Bocskay, who was chosen prince by the nobles and Szeklers on February 22nd, 1605, but died on September 29th, 1606. Siegmund Rakoczy occupied the country from February, 1607, but abdicated on March 3rd, 1608. Gabriel Báthory now ascended the throne. He captured Hermannstadt and attempted to get possession of Kronstadt. But on October 16th, 1612, the people of Kronstadt inflicted a severe defeat upon him, under the leadership of their burgomaster, Michael Weiss, who lost his life in the battle. Shortly afterwards the population of Transylvania rose in a body against this crazy tyrant; he was deposed and murdered at Grosswardein, while in the act of flight, on October 27th, 1613. Gabriel Isethlen, the leader of the revolt, restored the old privileges of the Saxons. After his early death on November 15th, 1629, a Saxon chronicler justly wrote:

**Crazy Tyrant
Deposed
and Murdered**

"God grant this famous hero peaceful rest and a joyous resurrection hereafter, for he left the country securer than he found it." In the age of the two George Rakoczys (1631-1660) Transylvania suffered from wars with Moldavia, Wallachia, and Poland. Recognising the situation as impossible, Michael Apasi broke away from the Turkish supremacy and placed Transylvania under the protection of Leopold I., by the Tractatus Hallerianus of 1686, the terms of which he was compelled to repeat with greater emphasis in the convention of Blasendorf of October 27th, 1687. The country was occupied by the imperial troops, and at the diet of Fogaras the oath of fidelity was taken to the Hapsburgs as the hereditary kings of Hungary. Some resistance was offered only by the lower classes of Kronstadt; the town was forced to surrender to the general Veterani on May 16th, 1688. By the "Diploma of Leopold" of December 4th, 1691, the Saxons were secured in the possession of their rights. The government of the Queen-empress Maria Theresa, who made Transylvania a principality in 1765, was followed by the ill-considered reforms of her son Joseph II., when the special constitution of the Saxons was in great measure sacrificed.

Far in the south, in the Banate of Temes and in the Bacska, are the last and most recent German settlements in Hungary. The Banate of Temes is bounded by the Danube, the Theiss, the Maros, and the mountains of Transylvania. After 166 years of Turkish rule it was restored to Hungary by the peace of Poscharevatz on July 21st, 1718, which followed the victories of Prince Eugene of Savoy. During the Turkish supremacy the wide lowlands and hill districts of the counties of Torontal and Temes were transformed into a desert. Consequently Count Claudius Florimond Mercy, the first governor of this waste, brought in colonists from Germany, Italy, and Spain after the year 1720. In 1728 there were ten villages occupied by Suabians, one village of Italians, and one of Spaniards. Under Mercy's government, between 1722 and 1730, the town and fortress of Temesvar were restored, and numerous villages were founded and occupied with colonists who came from Trèves, Cologne, Alsace-Lorraine,

Luxemburg, and the Black Forest. After the count's heroic death at Crocetta, near Parma, on June 29th, 1734, the settlements entered upon a period of distress, the devastation of the Turkish wars, between 1737-1739, thinning their numbers.

Under Maria Theresa a special colonial commission was set on foot in Vienna on July 22nd, 1766, which brought in Catholic colonists from the districts of Havenstein, Trèves, Lorraine, and the Breisgau. At that time more than 25,000 Germans are said to have found a home in the Banate. Moreover, the Emperor Joseph II., who made a personal visit to the Banate, issued an "immigration patent" on September 21st, 1782, in which he gave a special invitation to "members of the German Empire in the Upper Rhine district" to take up settlements. By the terms of this patent the immigrants were to travel free of expense, to receive allotments of ground for building and cultivation, necessary implements, and a certain sum of money. The Germans came in large numbers, built fourteen new settlements in 1784-1786, and increased thirteen others. The neighbouring county of Bacs, which had been wrested from the Ottomans immediately after the victory of Mohacs in 1687, received attention at a later period than the Banate. In accordance with the "colonisation patent" of 1763 full arrangements were made by a royal commission for the occupation of the district by Germans. The greatest influx of settlers took place between May 1st, 1784, and November 30th, 1785; during that period 2,057 families, amounting to 9,201 persons, entered the county of Bacs. Then, by the decree of April 24th, 1786, further immigration at the expense of the state was stopped. As most of the Germans were of the agricultural class, numerous large villages arose, which have preserved their German character to the present day. The number of Germans here amounts to about 30 per cent. of the whole population. The chief places inhabited by Germans are Apatin, Cservenka, Csonopla, Kula, Alt-Futak, Alt-Szivacz, Bajmok, Stanisics. In spite of the number of languages spoken upon this frontier district, German is at the present time predominant.

**The Emperor
Fosters
Immigration**

HEINRICH VON VLISLOCKI
HANS F. HELMOLT

EASTERN
EUROPE TO
THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION



THE
WESTERN
SLAVS
I

BOHEMIA, MORAVIA AND SILESIA THE RISE AND FALL OF THE CZECH KINGDOM

THE realms of which we are accustomed to think to-day inclusively as Austria are occupied by an extraordinary composite of nationalities. Throughout the greater part of it the Teuton has planted himself, but in only a small portion of the whole is he the historical lord of the land. In fact, he is a colonist. Hungary is a Magyar kingdom, ethnologically of Mongol origin. The south-west, as we have also seen, is Slavonic. The north-west—Bohemia and Moravia—is also Slavonic. Yet the sceptre of the whole has passed to the ruling house of the German wedge thrust in between the southern and the western Slavs. Thus, while the house of Hapsburg is of the West, and throughout its history essentially a western power, the great bulk of its dominions to-day belongs historically to the East of Europe.

**The Farmer
King of
Bohemia**

Bohemia, with Moravia, forms the central district of Europe. Every wave of barbarian migration surged against it, most of them seem at one time or another to have worked into it or through it—Kelt and Teuton, Mongol and Slav. Who was in occupation at any given time till long after Rome had ceased to be imperial, it is nearly impossible to determine. It seems, however, tolerably clear that in the sixth century the Slavs were in possession; and in the seventh, the Mongol Avar "Empire," of which little enough is known, disappeared as the Huns disappeared; leaving the Slavs to work out their own future.

The further development of the Slav settlement, its extension, and its political organisation, are hidden from us by a gap in tradition, extending over more than a century and a half. We may, however, conclude that the international development of the country progressed considerably, from the Bohemian legend as related by Košmas in the beginning of the twelfth

century, which tells of Krok, Libusha, and Premysl, the farmer of Staditz, who was called from the ploughshare to the throne, and became the ancestor of the first royal house of Bohemia.

**Louis the
Pious a Man
of Peace**

It is probable that political and social life in Moravia developed much more quickly and strongly during the same period; for before Bohemia emerges from the obscurity of legend into the clear light of history, there rises on Moravian soil, quietly and without any legendary history, a self-contained principality known as the Moravian kingdom of the Moimirids, after the founder of the dynasty, Moimir. During the military period of Charles the Great it is unknown, and it appears in its full power only during the peaceful reign of Louis the Pious. While Moimir did homage to the German emperor and offered presents, he extended his power eastwards, driving out of his country the neighbouring Slav prince who had settled in Neitra. The Frankish counts in the East Mark and in Pannonia had every opportunity of watching the growth of the neighbouring Moravian kingdom, and the fact that the Slav prince took refuge with them upon his expulsion, and received their support, tends to show that Moimir's aspirations met with no approval upon this side. However, serious opposition to the powers rising on the frontier of the empire formed no part of the policy of Louis the Pious. After the treaty of Verdun, in 843, Lewis the German took over, with his districts in the east, the task of securing supremacy of the empire formerly founded by the Emperor Charles over the neighbouring Slavs; it was inevitable that a struggle between the two states should break out, as indeed the Franks had already expected on their side. Even the fragmentary

descriptions which have come down to us give an idea of the fury and extent of this struggle, in which the weaker side, the Moimirid principality, always reappears upon the scene, heroically maintaining its position in spite of repeated defeat. Moimir himself escaped into his fortified castles from the first attack which the

German Armies in Moravia German king delivered in the year 846. His rule, however, was brought to an end by a domestic conspiracy led by his own nephew Rastiz, or Rastislav. The second Moimirid then received the inheritance of his uncle from the hands of the Franks, to govern the land likewise under their supremacy. The struggle, however, soon broke out anew, because Rastislav followed in his predecessor's footsteps, and strove to secure complete independence of the Frankish kingdom. German armies repeatedly marched upon Moravia in the years 855, 864, 866, and 869. However, no decisive battle took place. At one time by pretended submission, and at another by flight into his impregnable castles, Rastislav forced the Franks either to make peace or to retire from the inhospitable country. Once again domestic treachery placed the Moravian prince in the power of Lewis, in 870. The defeater of Rastislav, his nephew Svatopluk (Zwentibold), secured the supremacy over the whole of Moravia under the protectorate of France, while his uncle was punished by blinding and confinement in a French monastery.

The political struggle for the foundation of a powerful Slav empire was accompanied, from the outset, by a serious attempt to break the ecclesiastical ties which united these countries with Germany. German, Italian, and Greek priests were working simultaneously in the country, and the disastrous consequences to the land afforded the prince Rastislav a plausible excuse for appearing before

Early Missioners of the "True Faith" the Roman Pope Nicholas I. with a request that he should decide what priests should henceforward be permitted to preach and teach in Moravia. The Pope, however, is said to have declined to consider the question, or perhaps to have decided it against the wishes of the Moravian prince, who in 863 asked for fresh teachers from the Greek emperor Michael III. to preach the true faith to the Moravian nation in their own language.

The mission was entrusted to the brothers Constantine and Methodius of Thessalonica. Their spiritual work in Moravia began in the year 864; as, however, they possessed no high ecclesiastical rank, they confined themselves at first to the education of the children. As they desired to fulfil the object of their mission, the introduction of divine service in the Slavonic language, both into the Moravian and also into the neighbouring Slav kingdom of the Pannonian prince Kozel, the brothers, accompanied by the most capable of their scholars, betook themselves to Rome in 867, in order to secure the Pope's permission for the use of the Slavonic liturgy. Pope Hadrian II. is said to have fulfilled the wish of the Moravians in 868.

Feeling, however, a presentiment of approaching death, Constantine resolved not to return to Moravia; he entered the monastery at Rome, took the name Cyril as a monk, and died shortly afterwards, on February 14th, 869. The continuation of his apostolic work was left to his brother Methodius, who had

Rastislav Loses His Throne been consecrated bishop at Rome. Hardly, however, had he returned to Moravia with the intention of resuming the struggle against the German clergy, so successfully begun, when the revolution took place which cost Rastislav his throne and freedom, and transformed Moravia practically into a Frankish mark. Methodius then succumbed to his opponents; for two and a half years, during the first years of the reign of Svatopluk in Moravia, he remained a prisoner in a German monastery.

Friendly as were the relations existing between the new Moravian prince and the neighbouring German Empire, and in particular with Karlmann, the count of the East Mark, they continued but a short time. So soon as Karlmann had reason to suspect the fidelity of Svatopluk, he seized his person and his property, and retained him at his court in honourable confinement, with the idea that his removal would make it easier to establish Frankish supremacy in Moravia. However, the oppressed Moravian population began a desperate attempt to secure their freedom. Karlmann thought that he could entrust the task of crushing this movement to no more suitable person than Svatopluk, so entirely had the Slav won

RISE AND FALL OF THE CZECH KINGDOM

the confidence of the German. Hardly, however, did Svatopluk find himself among his own people, ere he gave rein to his long-repressed fury, and with one blow destroyed not only the army which had been sent to his support, but also all semblance of Frankish dominion in Moravia. In the two following years (872 and 873) Karlmann was unable to break down the resistance of Svatopluk. Not until the year 874 have we direct evidence of the conclusion of a peace at Forchheim, under which Svatopluk promised fidelity, obedience, and the usual annual tribute. Peace for eight years followed this act of submission.

During the period of this national rising the Moravians also remembered Methodius in his imprisonment abroad; their representations at Rome eventually induced Pope John VIII. to order the Bavarian bishops to liberate the Moravian apostle. Methodius immediately proceeded—about the outset of the year 873—to Kozel, in the Pannonian principality, and shortly afterwards to Moravia, where he was received with marks of high respect on the part of the prince and people. Svatopluk, however, failed to appreciate the help which might have been given to his political plans by a firm establishment of the Slavonic Church in the country. During the dogmatic quarrels between Methodius and the Bavarian clergy he



PURE GIPSY TYPE OF BOHEMIA

maintained a position of neutrality: he went so far as to express the wish that Methodius should prove his orthodoxy before the Pope at Rome. The latter was thus for the second time obliged to journey thither, and in the year 880 returned to his diocese under full papal protection, and with further recognition of the dignity of his position. Even now, however, it was impossible for him to gain a complete victory over his opponents in Moravia; the Bavarian clergy maintained their position in the country, and threw obstacles in his way. It was not until the last years of his life—he died on April 6th, 885—that his position in Moravia became more peaceful.

Within this period (882–884) occurred many violent political struggles between Svatopluk and the neighbouring Frankish districts. The Moravian prince then appeared as the protector of one of two families who were struggling to secure the position of count in the Traungau and in the East Mark, while Arnulf, or Arnolf, the son of Karlmann, who governed the marks of Karantania and Pannonia, supported the opposition party. The war began in 882. In 883 Svatopluk was raging in Pannonia "like a wolf," and in the following year hostilities were renewed. The feud was repressed only upon the interference of the Emperor Charles III. in the East Mark in August,



TYPE OF BOHEMIAN WOMAN

884. In 885 peace was concluded between Svatopluk and Arnulf, and resulted in a mutual understanding so complete that, when Arnulf became candidate for the crown of Germany in Frankfort in the year 887, Svatopluk zealously supported him. Under such circumstances the work of Cyril and

Slav Priests' Flight from Persecution

Methodius could not flourish in Moravia, the more so as the death of the latter had thrown the entire responsibility upon the feeble shoulders of a disciple. In the very year of the death of Methodius, the year of Svatopluk's reconciliation with the Franks, a general persecution of the disciples of Methodius began in Moravia; only a few received permission from Svatopluk to leave the country. The Slav priests then took refuge in the south Slavonic countries, where their liturgy found a field unexpectedly productive.

Thus, politically as well as ecclesiastically, Moravia remained in peaceful dependence upon the Frankish Empire until the year 890. At that time divergent conceptions concerning the relation of the Moravian princes to the German king brought forth new points of difference, which were to be solved only by further fighting. In the first campaign in 892, and more especially in the following year, the Moravians held the field; but in the year 895, when the power of the Slav kingdom for resistance was to be tested for the third time, Svatopluk died a sudden but natural death. With him disappeared irrevocably the whole splendour of the Moravian kingdom. The violent struggle between the brothers, who were the heirs of Svatopluk, accelerated the downfall, and the strength of the country was further weakened by the secession of both Bohemian and Silesian districts, over which the military power of Svatopluk had extended his dominion. Under these

Moravia Falls Before the Wild Magyars

circumstances it was impossible for the country to resist for any length of time the fearful attacks of the Magyars, who advanced with barbaric ferocity. In the year 906 Moravia succumbed to this enemy, whom she had hardly had time to observe, much less to guard against, after concluding, in the year 901, a peace with her great enemy the Franks, which in no way limited her constitutional independence. The Moimirids had eyes

only for the limitations which hindered their national development upon the west, and failed to see the dangers which threatened their unprotected eastern frontier; this neglect brought about the downfall of their carefully constructed empire.

The downfall of the old Moravian kingdom made room for the development of other Slavonic states which had existed under the protection and government of the Moimirid Empire at the time of its highest power; such were the Bohemian duchy on the west and the Polish duchy on the north-east of Moravia. The fortunes of Bohemia in particular were, during the ninth century, often closely linked with those of her more important neighbour on the east. The expeditions of the Franks were on several occasions directed against both countries. The activity of the Slav apostles in Moravia seems to have been not unheeded in Bohemia; there is evidence for the fact that the Bohemian Duke Borivoi was baptised by Methodius. In individual points, however, the relations of the two countries in politics and religion are some-

Christianity Established in Bohemia

what obscure, for the reason that the history of Bohemia is of a very legendary character until late in the ninth century. Borivoi, a contemporary of Svatopluk, is the first historical prince in Bohemia, and his name follows a long series of mythical rulers.

However, the foundation of a uniform kingdom, and the definite establishment of the Christian faith in Bohemia, belong to the period of the sons of Borivoi—Spitignev and Wratislav—and his grandsons—Wenzel the Saint and Boleslav I. As early as the reign of Wenzel, or Wenceslaus, took place the first inevitable collision between the German Empire, which had gained in strength since the accession of Henry the Fowler and the Slav power, which had grown up during the Hungarian wars. The struggle had fatal effects upon German prosperity. Wenzel was a peace-loving prince, whose mind was bent more upon the salvation of the Church than on temporal success; he readily recognised the supremacy of the German king, and agreed to the old tribute, when Henry I. appeared before Prague in the year 928. When, however, Wenzel, in the course of domestic struggles, lost his life in the year 935 at the hands of his brothers and allies, and Boleslav I.,



WENZEL OF BOHEMIA: "THE GOOD KING WENCESLAUS"

Wenzel's thoughtfulness and regard for others endeared him to his people. Of his humility and consideration a pretty story is told. One cold, frosty night, so runs the tale, he saw a poor man in the snow gathering fuel. His heart was touched, and calling on his page to "Bring me flesh and bring me wine, bring me pine-logs hither; thou and I will see him dine, when we bear them thither," they went out "in the rude wind's wild lament" on their mission of mercy.

"the fratricide," became duke, the war with Germany broke out afresh. The Bohemian prince held out for a long time in the frontier fortresses and abattis, which protected his country against King Otto I., then hard pressed by enemies on many sides. Eventually, however, Boleslav's strength grew feeble, and in 950 he sub-

The New Polish Empire

mitted to the same conditions under which his brother and predecessor had recognised German supremacy. In the battle of the Lechfeld, in the year 955, a Bohemian auxiliary force fought side by side with the troops of the united German races. Boleslav, who protected his frontiers against the impetuous Magyars, pursued the defeated enemy, and inflicted further defeat upon them.

About this time appeared a dangerous rival to the rising Premyslid principality; this was the Polish Empire. We first become acquainted with the existence of this new power in the lowlands between the Oder and the Warthe about 963; its political centre was Gnesen, and it extended south-west to the modern Silesia, where it touched the Bohemian kingdom. At first the two Slav principalities maintained friendly relations; the Polish Duke Mesko I., who died in 992, married Dubrava, the daughter of Boleslav I. of Bohemia. She it was who won over both her husband and his people to Christianity. As early as the year 968 a Polish bishopric was founded in Posen, some years before that of Prague. Bohemian auxiliary troops supported Mesko in his struggles against his northern neighbours. The Polish and Bohemian princes—the latter was the son and namesake of Boleslav I.—made an alliance, and joined in helping the Bavarian Duke Henry against the Emperors Otto II. and Otto III. in the years 976 and 983-985.

Then, however, the bond of friendship between the two brothers-in-law was

Bohemia

Rushing to its Downfall

broken; Dubrava had died in 977. In the year 990 our authorities speak of the "bitter hostility" existing between the two, as the Pole had captured a considerable district from Bohemia, and had succeeded in maintaining his position in a series of battles. Accurate geographical information is wanting, but from the mention of the place Niemtsch it has been concluded that the scene of the war was Silesia. A long period of

bitter struggle between the two neighbouring states followed, which severely tested the resources of the Premyslid kingdom.

After about a century of development Bohemia had now arrived at a turning-point which is marked upon the one hand by a decline in political power, and on the other by violent domestic convulsions. That period came when Adalbert, the second Bishop of Prague, abandoned "the blind nation rushing to its own downfall," left his country and his home, and in 997 sacrificed his life in missionary work among the savage Prussians. It is the period when a noble native family, the Slavniks, from which Adalbert was sprung, was exterminated by Duke Boleslav II. and the nobility. The contagion of discord soon extended to the royal family, and the Premyslids and the Bohemians were governed by dukes, designated by the chroniclers as "basilisks," or "poisonous vipers."

Hardly had Boleslav III., the son of Boleslav II., assumed the government in the year 999 when he attempted to destroy his younger brothers, Jaromir and Udalrich, and upon the failure of his attempt drove them out of the country with their mother; they found a refuge at the imperial court in Germany. The condition of affairs naturally enabled the warlike Polish Duke Boleslav I. Chabri (992-1025) to seize Bohemia, with the help of dissatisfied Bohemian nobles, at the outset of the year 1003, after previously conquering the German frontier land between the Oder and the Elbe, and also Moravia. He declined, however, to do homage to the emperor for his new dominions, and Henry II. resolved to deprive the Pole of his latest acquisitions. Bohemia was reconquered at the first attack, in 1004, and Prince Jaromir was invested with the Duchy of Bohemia. The struggle for the other conquests of the Pole ended in a long war between the German emperor, who was supported by the Bohemians, and Boleslav Chabri; the war occupied almost the entire reign of this prince.

In the course of the struggle between the Bohemian and Polish powers victory returned to the flag of the former, especially after the death of Boleslav Chabri, when a period of internal confusion began in Poland; while in Bohemia, after the short rule of Jaromir, his brother

RISE AND FALL OF THE CZECH KINGDOM

Udalrich seized the reins of government, with the support of his bold son Bretislav. To Bretislav is in particular due the achievement of obtaining from Poland the land of Moravia in 1029, the last of the great conquests of the period of Boleslav Chabri. The union of this district with Bohemia materially increased the prestige and the strength of the Premyslid dynasty.

After the death of his father Udalrich, in 1034, Bretislav took over the sole government. In 1039 he undertook an expedition into Poland with a large army, and made a victorious advance as far as Gnesen, plundering and devastating the land on all sides. At the point where the corpse of the Bishop of Prague, Adalbert, had been laid to rest after his martyrdom at the hands of the Prussians, in 997, Bretislav atoned for the ingratitude of his forefathers to this noble man; he made his Bohemian and Moravian subjects renounce at the martyr's grave, while they were in arms, a number of heathen customs of long standing, against which Adalbert had inveighed. The "sacred burden," the remains of the martyr, were then brought back to his native land.

The conquests, however, of certain districts of Poland had to be abandoned when the Emperor Henry III. protested against them. Like Henry II. before him, his son was determined to prevent the creation of a great Slav empire on the east of Germany. Bretislav accepted the challenge forthwith, and in 1040, the first year of the war, he secured a great success. In the following year, however, the course of the campaign was so disastrous to the Bohemians, owing to the treacherous desertion of certain nobles to the emperor's cause, that the Bohemian ruler was forced to sue for peace. Only two Silesian districts of his Polish conquests were


left to him, and these were shortly afterwards perforce restored to the Polish prince in return for a yearly tribute. Henceforward Bretislav renounced all military operations against the German Empire, and, indeed, supported the emperor in his campaigns, especially against Hungary. Bretislav secured peace and quiet for the advancement of civilisation and economic prosperity in his territories. During his government in Bohemia and Moravia several important monasteries were founded. In the interior of his extensive empire he hoped to be able to secure permanent order, even after his death, through his heirs. He bequeathed to his

first-born son, Spitignev, the government in Bohemia, together with the general right of supremacy; Moravia he divided among his three younger sons, Wratislav, Konrad, and Otto. A fifth son, Jaromir, was intended for the Church.

Bretislav had, however, taken inadequate measures to secure the performance of these conditions, and the reaction began immediately after his

death in 1055. Spitignev deprived his Moravian brothers of their rule, destroyed the nobility of Moravia, who attempted to offer resistance to his aggressive measures, and finally, for unknown reasons, expelled from Bohemia the Germans, who had acquired great influence during his father's reign; he also banished his mother, Judith von Schweinfurt, the first German princess who had occupied the throne of the Premyslids. His government, however, lasted scarcely six years (1055-1061).

His brother and successor, Duke Wratislav II., reverted to his father's policy. Bretislav had given Moravia its first monastery by his foundation at Raigern in 1048, and Wratislav, notwithstanding the great difficulties raised in his path by his brother Jaromir-Gebhard, Bishop of



THE ANCIENT CROWN OF BOHEMIA

This famous crown of Bohemia, often called the crown of St. Wenceslaus, dates from the fourteenth century, and is kept in the treasury of St. Veit at Prague.

The Disloyal Nobles of Bohemia

Prague, founded the bishopric of Olmütz in 1062, which afterwards became the ecclesiastical centre of Moravia. Of very considerable importance to Bohemia and to the German Empire are the personal relations upon which Duke Wratislav entered with the Emperor Henry IV.; these endured unchanged during the whole

Bohemian Duke Assumes Title of King government of the two rulers, notwithstanding the general secession of the princes from the emperor

and the warnings of Pope Gregory VII. As a reward for this personal fidelity and for the constant military help which the formidable reputation of his troops was able to give the emperor, the Bohemian duke was rewarded at different times by neighbouring pieces of territory, though he was unable to maintain a permanent supremacy over them, and in the year 1086 he was allowed to assume the dignity of king, though this was merely a personal concession to himself.

So great was the reputation possessed by Wratislav in Germany that the Archbishop Wezilo of Mayence announced the elevation of the Bohemian duke to the dignity of king in these words to the Pope: "All are agreed that he would have been worthy of even higher favour, if any such could have been found for him." Only in his own house did Wratislav fail to secure peace. There were continual quarrels, now with his brother the Bishop of Prague, now again with his other brothers the Moravian princes, and also with his son and his nephews. These differences often caused local disturbance, and sometimes forced him to take up arms against his opponents. The cause of them among the Premyslids—and they were to endure for almost the next century and a half—consisted in that regulation for the succession, the "Justitia Bohemorum," which Duke Bretislav is said to have arranged upon his

Throne of Bohemia in Dispute death-bed, and according to which supremacy was to fall to the eldest son of the house. It was the Moravian princes who

more particularly revolted against the power of the Duke of Bohemia in the attempt to establish their claim to the Bohemian throne. During the reign of the two successors of Wratislav, who died in 1092, his sons Bretislav II. and Borivoi, we have struggles with Udalrich of Brünn and Lutold of Znaim in 1101, and some

years later—in 1105 and 1107—with Duke Svatopluk of Olmütz; these produced very serious disturbances. At the same time the Premyslid power was involved in numerous military enterprises abroad, at one time against Hungary, at another against Poland—now upon its own initiative, and again as following the German kings.

The relations of the country to the empire were by no means undisturbed by this internal confusion; on the contrary, the emperor was often called in as arbitrator. This struggle increases in dramatic force until it reaches its highest point in the year 1125. Duke Vladislav, also a son of Wratislav II., had died, and had been succeeded in the government by his younger brother Sobeslav; he was opposed by his cousin Prince Otto of Olmütz, who found a powerful ally in King Lothar of Süpplingenburg. Hitherto German kings had offered no direct interference in the struggle of the Bohemian rivals, but Lothar led the army to Bohemia in person to support the cause of his protégé Otto. The result was the fearful battle of Kulm on February 18th, 1126, in which

Bohemia's Wars of Succession not only the German knights in the king's service met with total defeat, but the Moravian prince was also slain. The

wars of succession were, however, not concluded. During the government of Sobeslav (1125-1140) the country was in a continual state of internal ferment. However, the duke vigorously suppressed one conspiracy after another, and thus secured time to carry on his numerous foreign wars, whether against Poland, which he repeatedly devastated between 1132 and 1135, or in Germany, Italy, and Hungary, in the service of King Lothar, with whom he had made peace immediately after the battle of Kulm.

Under the successor of Sobeslav, his nephew Vladislav II., the smouldering fire blazed up. The youthful Bohemian duke was opposed simultaneously by a number of Bohemian Premyslid princes, by the Moravian princes of Brünn, Olmütz, and Znaim, and by a portion of the Bohemian nobility. Thanks, however, to his own determination, to the fidelity of his followers, including his brother Thebald and the Bishop of Olmütz, and to the vigorous support afforded by the Emperor Conrad II., a half-brother of his wife Gertrude, he succeeded in forcing the allies to retreat. The struggles of the Duke of Bohemia

RISE AND FALL OF THE CZECH KINGDOM

with the Moravian Premyslids, especially with Conrad of Znaim, endured for years. Eventually the forces of the latter were exhausted, and the world-inspiring idea of a Second Crusade diverted men's minds from the monotony of domestic strife. The close relations of Bohemia to the German Empire at that time, and also the energy of Bishop Henry of Olmütz, made the political movements felt in this country in full force. The summons for a crusade to Palestine in 1147, and for a simultaneous enterprise against the heathen Wends on the lower Elbe and Vistula, was enthusiastically received by Bohemia and Moravia. Under the leadership of Bishop Henry and some of the Premyslid princes, one party started off with the northern crusading army, while Duke Vladislav with a no less splendid force joined Conrad III. and the eastern host, though the duke was forced to return from Constantinople or Nicæa by reason of the great hardships of the campaign.

A few years later, on June 25th, 1150, death deprived the duke of his faithful counsellor, Bishop Henry. The bishop was a personality of very high importance both in the ecclesiastical and political world. Fully penetrated by German ideas and German culture, he was respected both by the Emperor Conrad and by Pope Eugenius III., who selected him for important diplomatic missions, such, for instance, as the attempted union between the Greek and Roman Churches proposed by the Pope. The Pope's words to the emperor respecting this bishop are more than a mere compliment: "Though we should have been very glad to keep with us for some time in high honour and affection this good and pious man, yet we send him back to your Highness, knowing as we do how great is your need of him." Between the years 1142 and 1147 we see Henry at least once every year at the German court, and in personal attendance upon the Emperor Conrad.

Henry's position in the empire can be well inferred from the words of the emperor in an official document, to the effect that he had chosen the Bishop of Olmütz in preference to all the bishops in the empire, on account of his stainless faith as a teacher and mediator in all things pertaining to the service of God. His energy as regards Bohemia and Moravia was very considerably paralysed by the endless

quarrels of the Premyslids among themselves. The fact is, however, of importance that he was, by reason of his connection with Germany, the first means of bringing the ideas of German civilisation into Moravia and the Premyslid countries; for the church of Olmütz, for instance, he secured, in full accordance with German custom, a grant of jurisdictional immunity — a privilege which had hitherto been unknown in this district, and was soon to become of great importance to legal developments in Bohemia and Moravia. The reign of Vladislav continued long after the death of the bishop; the king lived in prosperity and fame to his latest years. The dangers threatened by Moravia had been obviated for the moment by establishing Bohemian Premyslids in the divided principalities. It is true that many a banished Premyslid prince was living abroad, only waiting for the moment when the throne of Vladislav should begin to totter; yet he was successful in preserving his rule for a long time from any shattering blow.

An important means to this end was the fact that upon the accession of Frederic I. (Barbarossa) to the German throne in 1152, Vladislav continued in the traditional path of fidelity to the emperor and empire. At the right moment, and by means of the dexterous mediation of Bishop Daniel of Prague, the tie between the two princes was drawn even closer in June, 1156. The Duke of Bohemia undertook to place his subjects at the emperor's disposal for military expeditions, and in return for this he received certain small concessions of territory, and also the honour of kingship, which, exactly seventy years before, had been conferred by the Emperor Henry IV. upon his grandfather, Wratislav II.

Bohemia now entered upon a military period. First of all the country shared in Barbarossa's Polish campaign of 1157, crossed the Oder, and cleared the path far into a foreign country for the imperial army. Though the enterprise had no importance for Bohemia itself, it was of great import to the independent principality of Silesia. This campaign, which was repeated in 1163, resulted in the recall of the sons of Vladislav II. of Poland by the Polish duke Boleslav IV. Kendzierzavy. In 1146 he had driven his brother Vladislav II. of Poland from the throne, and

**King Vladislav
Enjoys Fame
and Prosperity**

**The Pope's
Eulogy of
Bishop Henry**

**Bohemia
as a Military
Power**

forced him to flee to his brother-in-law, the Emperor Conrad III. of Germany. His children were now reinstated in their father's inheritance, Breslau, Glogau, and Oppeln. The Polish supremacy over these districts was, indeed, maintained for a considerable period. But the three princes, Boleslav, Mesko, and Conrad, who had spent the whole of their youth in Germany, were the first who brought Silesia within the area of Western civilisation. It is of great historical importance that the Bohemian king co-operated in the first attempt to sunder Silesia from Poland, and connect it with the German Empire.

In the year following the Polish war the Bohemians received a summons to a campaign against Milan. The youthful Bohemian knights enthusiastically supported the summons, though the older nobility regarded the new policy with suspicion and distrust. Vladislav, without consulting his nobles, had been crowned by the emperor on January 11th, 1158, at an imperial diet in Regensburg, and, without their consent, had agreed to Frederic's conditions. Their opposition, however, went for nothing. The spirit and bravery of the Bohemian warriors contributed largely to secure victories for the emperor, both in this year, and in his later campaigns and conflicts in Italy in 1161, 1162, and 1167. It must be said that their plundering habits procured them an evil reputation both abroad and in the emperor's countries. Successful, too, was an expedition which King Vladislav led to Hungary in 1164, in order to support his protégé Stefan III. in the struggle for the succession against Stefan IV., who was supported by the Byzantine emperor. The treasures of the Greek campaign provided a rich booty.

Towards the end of Vladislav's reign his relations with Frederic Barbarossa were clouded for many reasons. Upon his resolve to transfer the government of Bohemia to his son Frederic without the consent of Barbarossa, the German emperor opposed this arbitrary action on the part of the Bohemian king, and, instead of Frederic, made his cousin Sobeslav II. Duke of Bohemia. The immediate consequence was a protracted struggle for the throne. Frederic was obliged to give way at first, but at a later period he

recovered the emperor's favour and reconquered the supremacy from Sobeslav in 1179.

In this struggle he was supported by Germany, and also, in particular, by the Moravian prince Conrad Otto, who, in all probability, was sprung from a collateral branch of the Bohemian Premyslids, and had succeeded under King Vladislav II. to the principality of Znaim upon the extinction of a native line of rulers.

From the beginning of Sobeslav's reign, Brünn and Olmütz were governed by his younger brothers, Udalrich and Wenzel, so that the Moravian branch of the Premyslids became entirely extinct about the year 1174. However, the struggle between Bohemia and Moravia broke out once again. The second reign of Frederic, the "inexperienced helmsman," as a contemporary chronicler names him, was as short as the first; a popular rising forced him to flight, and he applied for help to the emperor. The ducal throne of Bohemia seemed destined to fall to the Moravian prince Conrad Otto, who already united under his rule the three component kingdoms of Bohemia and Moravia. However, Frederic Barbarossa summoned the two Premyslids to appear before his court at Ratisbon, and delivered his decision on September 29th, 1182: Frederic was to reign in Bohemia, as before, while Conrad Otto was henceforward to govern Moravia as a margravate, immediately depending on the emperor and in complete independence of Bohemia.

After the death of Conrad Otto, in 1191, the struggle for the supremacy in Bohemia and Moravia broke out again between the two lines of the Sobeslavs and Vladislavs, and the emperor eventually decided in the favour of the latter, conferring Bohemia, in 1192, upon Premysl Ottokar and Moravia upon Vladislav Henry, the two younger brothers of the Duke Frederic, who died in 1189. Peace, however, was not even then secured. In the following year the brothers were driven out by their cousin Henry Bretislav, who was also Bishop of Prague, and ruled over both countries until 1197.

His death seemed likely to become the occasion of a further struggle for the succession between the two brothers, Premysl Ottokar and Vladislav Henry. The latter, however, was a peaceable character, and found a solution of the

RISE AND FALL OF THE CZECH KINGDOM

difficulty by offering his brother an arrangement for the partition of the empire, which occurred to his mind when the armies were drawn up for battle on December 6th, 1197. The proposition was that Premysl Ottokar should rule in Bohemia and Vladislav Henry in Moravia, while both "were to have one mind as they had one rule." Though this arrangement does not in the least represent the nature of their subsequent relations, it none the less remains certain that with it a new age begins in the history of the Premyslid kingdom.

This fraternal compact of 1197 brought to a somewhat unexpected conclusion the unfruitful period of Bohemian history, during which the domestic policy of the country was dominated by continual quarrels concerning the succession, while economic development and the progress of culture were checked, and only the unbridled warlike temperament of the people was stimulated. However, towards the close of the twelfth century the military element falls into the background of the history of the Bohemian territories,

Peace and Progress in Bohemia while civilisation and progress gain the upper hand. Feud and quarrel in the royal family disappear, and brotherly love and unity promote the bold plans conceived by the head of the family, the Duke of Bohemia, for the aggrandisement of his empire and his royal house. The German emperor no longer settles Bohemian affairs at his own will and pleasure; on the contrary, the Bohemian princes derive considerable advantage from the struggles and confusion prevailing in the German Empire. Supported with unselfish devotion by his Moravian brother, the Margrave Vladislav Henry, who died in 1222, both in his diplomatic and military enterprise, the new Duke of Bohemia cleverly utilised the quarrel of the rival German kings, Philip of Swabia and Otto of Brunswick, to secure the recognition of Bohemia as a kingdom for himself and his successors, first from Philip, then from Otto after Philip's secession to the other side, finally from Pope Innocent III., in 1204. Hardly had the youthful Hohenstauffen Frederic II. appeared upon the political scene, when the duke induced him also to confirm the existence of the kingdom, first in the year 1212 and afterwards in 1216, to recognise his first-born son as a successor

to Bohemia, and to grant other privileges in addition. This event marks the advancement of the right of primogeniture as the principle of succession against the right of seniority which had previously been accepted.

German colonisation gave the Slav territories, from a political standpoint, a new constitution for town and village, and from a social standpoint a class of free peasants and citizens hitherto unknown. The prosperous beginning of German colonisation received a further impulse under King Wenzel I. (1230-1253), notwithstanding the numerous military entanglements into which Bohemia was then drawn, chiefly with Austria, and in spite of the appalling danger threatened by the Mongol invasion of the year 1241. For the moment, however, Bohemia was spared.

It was Moravia, and especially Silesia, that suffered most heavily from the barbarians. The years 1157 and 1163 were, as regards the progress of political development and civilisation, an important turning point in the history of Silesia, as the government of the three Silesian princes betokens an entry of Germanising influences upon a large scale. The figures most distinguished from this point of view are Duke Boleslav I., the Long (1157-1202), his son Henry the Bearded (1203-1238), who is known for his participation in the founding of the German orders in Prussia, and his descendant Henry II. (1238-1241). The dominions of the latter extended far beyond the three original Silesian principalities. He ruled Cracow and part of Great Poland, which his father had already conquered in the course of wars against his Polish cousins.

However, this brilliant development of the Silesian principality was shaken to its depths in March, 1241, by the invasion of the Mongols, who reduced Poland to a desert as they advanced, and forced the Duke of Silesia to oppose them, if he did not wish to see the destruction of the civilisation laboriously acquired in the course of the last hundred years. The bloody battle on the Wahlstatt at Liegnitz, on April 9th, 1241, cost the lives of Henry and of numerous knights in his following. The further history of the Mongol invasion, which continued until the spring of 1242, and kept

the neighbouring territories of Austria and Moravia in suspense, ran its course upon Hungarian soil.

The next important event in the history of Bohemia was the death of Frederic II., Duke of Austria, and the last male descendant of the house of Babenberg, who was killed on June 15, 1246, in the battle on the Leitha against the Hungarians. The marriage between his niece Gertrude and the Bohemian prince Vladislav, who was now also margrave of Moravia, was not celebrated until this time, although it had been arranged years before; it seemed destined to bring the heritage of the house of Babenberg into the hands of the Premyslids. The most dangerous opponent of the Bohemian claims was the Emperor Frederic II., who desired to secure the Austrian territories, as being an imperial fief in abeyance. However, the struggle for the inheritance of Duke Frederic soon came to a rapid end, owing to the death of the Margrave Vladislav in 1247, and of the emperor in 1250. The claims of inheritance and of constitutional right were now thrown into the background; the disputed possessions passed to the greater power and the greater diplomatic capacity of the neighbouring princes of Bohemia-Moravia and of Hungary, with whom Bavaria was struggling for the prey. The new margrave of Moravia, Premysl Ottokar, the grandson of King Wenzel I., soon defeated Otto, the duke of Bavaria, after a short struggle in Upper and Lower Austria. In the year 1251 he was recognised as duke by the nobility and the towns of that district, and further secured his conquests by his connection with Margareta, the sister of the last Babenberg and the widow of King Henry VII.; in February, 1252, he married her, although she was considerably older than himself.

For the possession of Styria a lengthy struggle began between King Bela IV. of Hungary and Premysl Ottokar II., who also inherited the crown of Bohemia on the death of his father in 1253.

At the outset, success inclined to the side of the Magyar, chiefly owing to the support of the Pope, in 1254; eventually, however, the Bohemian king proved victorious in this quarter after his success at the battle of Kroissenbrunn. In July, 1260, the dissolution of his marriage with

the aged Margareta, his marriage with Cunigunde, the young granddaughter of the Hungarian king, in 1261, and his investiture with the two duchies of Austria and Styria by the German king Richard, in 1262, crowned the remarkable prosperity which had marked the first period of the reign of King Premysl Ottokar II.

The following decade (1273) also brought to the Bohemian king fame and victory in many of his military enterprises, and an increase of territory through his acquisition of Carinthia and Carniola, and of a certain power of protectorate over Eger and the surrounding district. Premysl Ottokar II. had then reached the zenith of his power. The domestic policy of his reign was marked by the continuation and the increase of the work of German colonisation, which his father and grandfather had introduced into the Premyslid kingdom. In this task he found a zealous helper in Bishop Bruno of Olmütz, who was descended from the family of the Holstein counts of Schaumberg, and administered the bishopric of Moravia from 1245 to 1281; he proved the king's best counsellor in all diplomatic and political undertakings. Bishop Bruno, together with Bishop Henry of Olmütz and Bishop Adalbert of Prague, formed a spiritual constellation in the history of the Premyslids. They set in motion a religious, civilising, and political influence which were felt far beyond the boundaries of their respective dioceses.

The privileges of the German towns increased from that period in Bohemia and Moravia. This advance in civilisation is the permanent result of the wide activities of Premysl Ottokar II.; for that vast political construction, the Bohemian-Austrian monarchy, which he seemed to have erected with so much cleverness, proved to be unstable; it was too largely founded upon the weakness of the German Empire and upon the vacillation and helplessness of the nominal kings of Germany. Hence for Premysl Ottokar the choice of Rudolf of Hapsburg as emperor on October 1st, 1273, marks the beginning of the decline of the Bohemian power.

This declension was rapidly completed. Premysl Ottokar refused to acknowledge his feudal dependency upon the new German king, thus challenging the emperor and the empire to war. For almost two years the Bohemian king succeeded

RISE AND FALL OF THE CZECH KINGDOM

in staving off the threatening secession of Styria and Austria, for the reason that Rudolf's attention was fully occupied elsewhere, while his means were insufficient to provide any vigorous support for his open and secret adherents in these territories. However, in the autumn of 1276 the Hapsburg led the imperial army through Austria to the walls of Vienna. Ottokar was abandoned, both by the Austrian nobles and by some of his most powerful Bohemian nobility, with the result that the two opponents never met in conflict; the Bohemian king preferred submission to the hazardous alternative of giving battle. The peace of Vienna on November 21st, 1276, deprived Premysl Ottokar II. of his position as a great power; he was obliged to surrender Austria, Styria, Carinthia, and other districts which he had conquered and not inherited, and to receive Bohemia and Moravia as the vassal of the German emperor.

This humiliating settlement, however, could not possibly be regarded by the proud prince as a permanent embargo on his schemes. Concerning the future

Bohemian King Falls in Battle relations of Bohemia with the empire, and regarding certain important points in the peace of Vienna, more particularly the amnesty to the Bohemian lords who had deserted Premysl Ottokar, and the proposed marriage of a son and daughter of the two princes, misunderstandings broke out, which soon ended in that fresh struggle with Rudolf which the Bohemian king was anxious to provoke. In the battle of Dürnkrot, on the Marchfeld, on August 26th, 1278, Premysl Ottokar was captured, in a condition of exhaustion, after a heroic struggle, and murdered by certain knights who had a private grudge against him. The Premyslid territories now surrendered, almost without resistance, to the German king, who was regarded with considerable favour by the German population of the towns, by a portion of the nobility, and not least by Bishop Bruno. The first years after the death of their great king were a time of misery for Bohemia. When, however, Wenzel II., who became the son-in-law and received the support of the German king, ascended the throne in 1283, a renewed period of prosperity seemed to have begun for the house of Premysl, facilitated both by a peaceable and

serious government and by the riches of the country, especially the income from the silver-mines. The young king, with his vivid interest in art and science, gained a great reputation for the Bohemian court, and made it a favourite resort of artists and scholars. This internal development was accompanied by

Silesia's Greatness at an End a successful foreign policy. After the struggle with the Mongols, Silesia ceases to rank among the countries of importance in the history of the world, and from 1241 its history is purely local. Once again the country was broken into petty principalities, some of which were in continual hostility with Poland, and were thus driven into connection with the Premyslid kingdom through affinities of civilisation and race. In the decisive battle on the Marchfeld the Dukes of Breslau, Glogau and Oppeln acted as the independent allies of the Bohemian king. King Wenzel of Bohemia, in later troubles, was supported by several Silesian dukes, who recognised him as their feudal overlord; he succeeded in conquering Cracow in 1291, and assumed the crown of Poland in Gnesen in 1300, uniting the heritage of the Piasts with that of the Premyslids.


Nor was this the end. In the following year—1301—the male line of the Hungarian royal house of Arpad became extinct, and one party in the country offered this crown to the Bohemian king; he did not accept it himself, but transferred it to his young son, Wenzel III., who was crowned king of Hungary at Stuhlweissenburg. However, this period of brilliant prosperity lasted but a short time for the Premyslids. The Hungarian crown could not be retained in face of the Angevin claims, and in the year 1304 Wenzel III. abandoned it. At the same time Wenzel II. became involved in war with the German king Albert. In the course of this struggle he died, **The Passing of the Premyslids** in 1305, at the age of thirty-four. When his heir was meditating an advance upon Poland in the following year—1306—to crush the rising of Vladislav Lokietek, the Polish claimant to the throne, he was murdered by an assassin in the castle of Olmütz; he died at the age of seventeen, the last male descendant of the distinguished house of the Premyslids, leaving no issue although married.



THE OLD TOWN BRIDGE TOWER AND THE TEYN CHURCH



THE ANCIENT BRIDGE AND THE CASTLE OF HRADS



PRAGUE THE BEAUTIFUL CAPITAL OF BOHEMIA

This famous city owes much of its beauty to Charles IV., who from 1347 to 1378 greatly extended his capital and erected such buildings as the Cathedral of St. Veit, the Teyn Church the Bridge Tower, the bridge across the Moldau and the Castle of Hrads.



BOHEMIA AND THE REFORMATION THE LUXEMBURG KINGS & THE HUSSITE WARS

CLAIMS to the Bohemian inheritance were now raised from two quarters: Duke Henry of Carinthia relied upon the claim of his wife Anna, the eldest sister of King Wenzel III.; on the other hand the German king Albert regarded Bohemia and Moravia as escheated fiefs of the empire, and conferred them upon his eldest son, Duke Rudolf of Austria.

After the premature death of Rudolf in 1307, Henry of Carinthia succeeded in securing a majority of the votes of the Bohemian nobility, and it was only in Moravia that King Albert could secure recognition for his second son Frederic. However, when Albert fell in the following year, 1308, under the murderous attack of his nephew John ("Parricida"), Duke Frederic was obliged to refrain from all attempts to continue the war against Henry in Bohemia and also to surrender Moravia, with the exception of certain towns which remained in his possession as a pledge for the repayment of the expenses of the war.

**King Henry's
Vanished
Prestige**

Henry of Carinthia was, however, unable to cope with the difficult party questions which troubled Bohemia. King and nobles, nobles and towns, were in a state of perpetual hostility. The result was seen in disturbances and acts of aggression which lost Henry his prestige in the country. A new party arose, led by the Abbot Conrad of Königssaal, which attempted to secure a new ruler by the marriage of Elizabeth, the youngest daughter of King Wenzel II.

Their choice fell upon John, the young son of the new German emperor Henry VII. of Luxemburg. On September 1st, 1310, the marriage of the German prince, who was fourteen years of age, with the Bohemian princess, who was eighteen, was celebrated in Speyer. The German emperor had released the Bohemians from their oath to the Duke of Carinthia in the previous July at Frankfort, and had invested his son with Bohemia and Moravia, as escheated fiefs of the empire. The conquest of the country was not a

lengthy task, as King Henry, recognising speedily the hopelessness of resistance, entered upon negotiations and voluntarily left the country. The occupation of Moravia was accomplished with equal facility. John even assumed the title of King of Poland, as a sign that he proposed to maintain the claims of his Premyslid predecessors to this crown.

Germans

**Expelled from
Bohemia**

The course of his government was soon, however, considerably disturbed, chiefly in consequence of the hostile feeling entertained by the high Bohemian nobility for Archbishop Peter of Mainz and other German counsellors, whom King Henry had sent to direct his inexperienced son. John found his difficulties increased in 1313 by the death of his imperial father, which deprived him of the support of the German Empire. He was obliged to consent to the expulsion of the Germans from Bohemia, and to resign the government of the country to Henry of Lipa, the most powerful of the Bohemian barons.

Peace, however, was not even then secured. Financial disputes between the king and his chief adviser, the extraordinary connection between Lipa and the Dowager Queen Elizabeth, the former consort both of Wenzel II. and Duke Rudolf, who resided in Königgrätz, and overshadowed the court of the queen proper, together with other causes, led to the forcible removal of Lipa in 1315, whereupon Archbishop Peter again received the position of chief minister. After a rule of two years he was again forced to yield to the powerful nobles in 1317.

**Revolt
Against
King John**

King John was weary of these domestic troubles, and turned his attention to foreign affairs, especially to the rivalry between Lewis of Bavaria and Frederic the Fair of Austria for the German crown; consequently the government of Bohemia and the work of resistance to the nobles devolved upon his wife Queen Elizabeth, who received very little support from her husband. The result was a general revolt

against the king in 1318, which he was powerless to suppress. Finally, by the intervention of Lewis of Bavaria, a somewhat degrading compromise with the revolted barons was effected at Tauss, and the king was forced to content himself with his title, his position, and the rich income of his territory. King John, a rest-

**Moravia
Freed from
the Hapsburgs**

less, cheerful, somewhat extravagant, but highly gifted and chivalrous character, secured a great extension of

territory for Bohemia in the course of the numerous enterprises and intrigues in which he was continually involved. After the death of the Margrave Waldemar of Brandenburg, the Oberlausitz fell into his hands in 1319. In 1322 he received in pawn from Lewis of Bavaria the town of Eger, with its territory, which has ever since remained in the possession of Bohemia. He was able definitely to liberate Moravia from all the claims and demands which the Hapsburgs could make upon that province. For a few years (1331-1333) he even secured possession of part of Lombardy, the government of which he entrusted to his eldest son Charles, while his youngest son, John Henry, received the province of Tyrol, with the hand of Margareta Mautsch, in 1330; but John Henry was unable to maintain his hold of this possession.

The most important acquisition made by King John was that of Silesia, which gave to Bohemia an enormous increase of extent and power. The connection of the Silesian princes with Bohemia had begun under the last of the Premyslids, and had been dissolved upon the extinction of the race; it was made permanent under the rule of King John. As early as the year 1327, upon the occasion of an expedition against Poland, John received the homage of the dukes of Upper Silesia. In the same year Breslau recognised the Bohemian

**Fall of "the
Crown of
Knighthood"**

king as its feudal overlord; this example was followed in 1328 by most of the duchies of Lower Silesia. In 1331

John, by a threat of invasion, forced Glogau to do homage. These acquisition were further secured by a treaty between King John and the Polish king Casimir, son of Vladislav Lokietek, in 1335, whereby John renounced the claims to the Polish crown, which he had hitherto maintained as heir of the Premyslids,

receiving in return the cession of the Silesian districts under Polish government.

When John fell, "the crown of knighthood," in the battle of Crecy-en-Ponthieu on August 26th, 1346, the anniversary of the death of Premysl Ottokar II., the domestic resources of Bohemia had been greatly shaken by his extravagant and unsystematic government. However, his successful foreign and military policy, which secured a position for his son and heir, Charles, had largely counterbalanced these disadvantages; for a time the Bohemian king ruled over a more extensive territory than any of his predecessors, with the exception of Premysl Ottokar II., had ever acquired. To this power was now added the dignity of the imperial crown. Thanks to the diplomacy of his father, Charles was elected as Charles IV. on July 11th, 1346, after the deposition of the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria.

On the death of his father, Charles was more than thirty years of age, and had enjoyed a wide experience in his youth. His father had sent him at an early age to complete his education at the court in

**The Youthful
Charles and his
Great Victory**

Paris, and his intellectual powers soon made it possible for him to take part in the business of government. At

the age of fifteen he was sent to Parma to administer, to guide, and to defend his father's Italian acquisitions. In the year 1332, at the age of sixteen, he won a brilliant victory over his powerful adversaries at San Felice. However, the Italian lands eventually proved untenable, and were sold by King John in the following year.

In 1333 Charles received the title of Margrave of Moravia, and took over the government of the hereditary dominions. He at once reduced the shattered resources of the kingdom to order. Intrigues among the nobles caused at times serious dissension between father and son. These quarrels reached their highest point in the years 1336-1337 when Charles was forced to resign the administration of Bohemia. But in 1338 a complete reconciliation was effected, and in 1341 King John, of his own initiative, secured the recognition of Charles as his successor in the Bohemian kingdom, during his own lifetime. Of special importance to Charles was the year 1342, when his former tutor and his father's friend at the French Court, the Archbishop Pierre Roger of Rouen, ascended the papal chair

BOHEMIA AND THE REFORMATION

as Clement VI. These two highly gifted men are said to have predicted their careers to one another during their intercourse in Paris.

The support of the Pope enabled Charles in 1344 to raise the bishopric of Prague, which had hitherto been subject to the metropolitan see of Mainz, to the rank of an independent archbishopric with jurisdiction over the bishopric of Olmütz in Moravia and the newly founded bishopric of Leitomischl in Bohemia. Clement VI. also took an honourable share in the promotion of the future king of Bohemia to the throne of Germany. Charles was spared the trouble of a struggle with the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria, who had been deposed on July 11th, 1346, for as he was on the point of marching against Lewis in 1347 he received the news of his rival's death.

Charles was therefore able to devote himself with greater vigour to the difficult task of conducting the business of the empire. As regarded the administration of his hereditary territories, he found a welcome supporter in his brother John Henry, upon whom he conferred the margraviate of Moravia as an hereditary fief on December 26th, 1349. So long as he lived, this brother was bound to Charles by ties of affection and friendship, and supported him zealously and unselfishly in his military and diplomatic enterprises. Their mutual relation is comparable to that which existed between King Premysl Ottokar I. and Vladislav Henry. Moravia being thus secured by inheritance to the second line of the Luxemburg house, the diocese of Olmütz and the province of Troppau were declared fiefs of the crown of Bohemia and made independent of the margraviate of Moravia. The duchy of Troppau had been already founded by King Premysl Ottokar II., who had reserved it for the support of his illegitimate son Nicholas I.; it had also been conferred as a fief by King John in 1318 upon the son and namesake of Nicholas, so that the arrangement of Charles only confirmed his father's dispositions. The rest of Silesia Charles had

already, in 1348, incorporated with the Bohemian crown as Emperor of Germany.

The assertion of the Emperor Maximilian that Charles IV. was the stepfather of the empire and the father of Bohemia is justified as regards the latter part of the remark. The whole of Charles's political activity was inspired by the idea of making his family and his country a great power. From the beginning of his independent reign to his death he exerted every effort to raise Bohemia to the level of civilisation and intellectual development already attained by more advanced countries. He extended his capital of Prague and laid the foundation of its great development, increasing its beauty by such constructions as the Cathedral of St. Veit, the Castle of Hrad, the Teyn Church,



THE FATHER OF BOHEMIA
Charles IV. was so called by the Emperor Maximilian for his immense services to his country, which advanced greatly in power and prosperity during his long reign.

and the bridge over the Moldau. He summoned artists of famous capacity, both German and Italian, architects and painters, brass-founders and sculptors, goldsmiths, and other miniature art workers. To his lively interest in science—he was himself an historical and theological author—the University of Prague owes its origin, at a time when such educational institutions were rare on the north of the Alps, except in France. Bologna and Paris served as patterns for the organisation of the university. Charles showed an extreme interest in jurisprudence. He was able to regulate imperial affairs by ordinances establishing a land peace, by the "Golden Bull" of 1356, and other edicts; he conceived the idea of providing a uniform legal code for Bohemia and Moravia in the "Majestas Carolina."

However, his intentions were frustrated by the resistance of the native nobility. Further important legal work was achieved in Silesia during his reign, such as the land register for the Duchy of Breslau, "a magnificent work, which has been a model for all later surveys;" the Silesian common law code, a redaction of the "Sachsenspiegel," with special modifications; and, finally, a special municipal code for Breslau. And Charles worked no less vigorously to secure material prosperity in his own dominions. Mining, forestry,

agriculture, and cattle farming then became extremely productive. Prague, next to Breslau, which he regarded with no less care, became one of the most important commercial centres in Central Europe, and a meeting-place of traffic from the south to the north, and from the west to the east. The energy manifested by Charles IV.

Bohemia's Succession of Plagues in promoting the advance of intellectual and material prosperity deserves the more recognition for the reason that severe plagues ravaged the country during the first years of his rule; such were the black death, the Jewish plague, and the "flagellant" outburst. Though these plagues did not prove so destructive in the hereditary lands of Charles as elsewhere, they were none the less a powerful obstacle to the development of trade and intercourse, of education and art.

It must also not be forgotten that the emperor's time was largely occupied by political business, military campaigns, and journeys to different parts of the empire, so that he was often absent from his hereditary territories for months at a time. The results of the energy which Charles IV. displayed through the thirty years of his reign, seem, in brief, to have been the securing of a prosperous future to the house of Luxemburg, which then counted numerous male descendants. Partly by bold opposition, partly by clever diplomacy, he gradually overcame the influence of the Wittelsbach family, which had hitherto been powerful, and finally secured from them the important Mark of Brandenburg for his own house in 1373.

At the beginning of his reign he was opposed by the King of Poland, whose hostility was supported by Duke Bolko of Schweidnitz-Jauer, the last of the Silesian princes who remained independent of Bohemia. In the year 1348, however, Charles concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with the King of Poland, while he so far secured the good favour of Bolko as to induce him to conclude a pact of inheritance with Bohemia in 1364; by this agreement Charles, who entered upon a third marriage, in 1353, with Anna, daughter of the Duke of Schweidnitz, secured a reasonable prospect of acquiring the latter's principality. These hopes were realised in a few years by the death of Bolko in 1368.

Charles had also a difficult problem to deal with in his relations with his stepson, Rudolf IV. of Austria. This prince was inspired by an invincible ambition for supremacy and power. He was anxious to secure an exceptional position for his kingdom among the German principalities, and when Charles opposed these ambitious designs, Rudolf was ready to adopt any and every means for their execution. He produced forged documents, and, what was more dangerous, made alliances with foreign princes against the emperor, supporting especially King Lewis of Hungary, who caused Charles IV. serious anxiety on more than one occasion. However, the diplomatic skill of the Luxemburg monarch was able gradually to overcome these dangers, and eventually to turn them to his own account. After 1363 the attention of Duke Rudolf was occupied by the acquisition of the Tyrol, and he began to feel the need of the emperor's support. In February, 1364, in the course of a meeting of nobles at Brünn, he concluded with Charles an important succession treaty, whereby the Luxemburg

The Death of Charles IV. and Hapsburg families were respectively to inherit one another's lands in case either house should become extinct in the male and female line. Charles considerably increased his dominions by purchase and by acquisition in other ways, especially in the Upper Palatinate and in Lausitz; also he attempted to secure for his family the prospect of succession to neighbouring thrones, particularly by well-considered family alliances. Both Rudolf IV., and his brother, Duke Albert III., who succeeded him as Duke of Austria in 1365, were married to daughters of Charles IV. His son Wenzel, born in 1361, by Anna, was originally betrothed to the niece, at that time the heiress of King Lewis of Hungary. When, however, in after years, this monarch had daughters of his own, the betrothal was dissolved, and in 1371 Wenzel married Johanna, the daughter of Albert, Duke of Bavaria. Charles IV. attempted to marry his second son, Sigismund, to Maria, the elder daughter and heiress apparent of Lewis of Hungary.

Charles IV. left his family in a strong position when he died, at the age of sixty-three, on November 29th, 1378. Wenzel had already, in 1376, been

BOHEMIA AND THE REFORMATION

appointed German Emperor by the Electors, and was also in possession of Bohemia and Silesia. The second son, Sigismund, received the Mark of Brandenburg, and the youngest, John, part of the Lausitz. The margraviate of Moravia had been governed until 1383 by Wenzel, the brother of Charles IV., who also ruled the duchy of Luxemburg. The Bohemian king held the feudal rights over this province, and after the death of the margrave John in 1375 the country was divided among his three sons, Jost, Prokop, and John Sobeslav.

Rarely do grandfather, father, and grandson display differences of life and

character so profound as may be noted in the case of John, Charles, and Wenzel. The diplomatic powers of King John reappear as practical statesmanship of a high order in Charles; in Wenzel, however, scarce the humblest remnant of political capacity is discernible; again, the extravagance of the grandfather becomes remarkable economy in the son and avarice in the grandson. John is a fiery, impetuous, chivalric figure, seeking and finding death in the press of battle; Charles is a more

patriarchal character, with no preference for war, though far from cowardly; Wenzel, as years pass by, exhibits a voluptuousness immoderate and even brutal, cowardice conjoined with cruelty, a blend of indolence and vacillation.

Two Popes Dispute the Tiara

Feeble as was his capacity for empire this prince was now confronted not only with the task of governing the realm of a great dynasty, but also with the administration of the vast German Empire, with its various and divergent interests; this, too, at a period when all the material for political and social conflagration had been collected. Shortly before the death of Charles IV. an event had occurred which threw the critical nature of the

general situation into strong relief. Two Popes were disputing the tiara, each with his own following among the princes and the clergy—Urban VI. at Rome and Clement VII. at Avignon. Wenzel, whose special business it should have been, as

German emperor, to allay the schism in the Church, calmly contemplated the spread of this disorder in every direction.

Another difficult problem for his consideration was the position of his brother Sigismund in Hungary. The Luxemburg prince had married Maria, the elder daughter of King Lewis I., who had no male issue, and occupied the throne

of Hungary and also, after 1370, that of Poland; on Lewis's death in 1382 his son-in-law claimed the Polish and Hungarian kingdoms in right of his wife. The attempt to secure Poland resulted in total failure, while Hungary was secured only after a severe struggle, which absorbed more of Wenzel's resources than he could well spare. Within the empire, again, the king was hard pressed by the struggle between the princes and the towns. The partiality which he at first displayed for



WENZEL IV., KING OF BOHEMIA

The eldest son of Charles IV., Wenzel, or Wenceslaus, succeeded his father on the throne of Bohemia in 1378, in which year he was also elected Emperor of Germany. His reign was one long succession of trouble and he died in 1419.

the latter was succeeded by indecision when his support proved inadequate to secure victory for the towns, and his diminishing interest in German affairs eventually lost him the sympathies of all parties alike.

These various foreign complications, for the successful solution of which Wenzel did not possess the judgment, the force of will, or the tenacity necessary, became far more dangerous on account of the rise of political, social, and religious difficulties, with which he was too weak to cope, within his own hereditary territories.

However, these menacing dangers were not apparent at the outset of his government in Bohemia. The organisation which Charles IV. had set on foot continued to

work excellently for a time, and Wenzel was not the man to strike out a line of his own. He continued the great architectural works which his father had begun; he extended the university; literary work, especially in the Czech language, met with his zealous support. It was at this period that Huss altered and

Crusade Against the Clergy

simplified the Bohemian orthography. But the signs of dissension in the public life of Bohemia grew more and more distinct. The University of Prague in particular was the starting point of the first line of cleavage. The Bohemian element in the population had grown until it outnumbered the other nationalities—the Bavarians, Saxons, and Poles—and the result was a demand for a corresponding redistribution of votes in municipal and other corporations. Soon, again, the Bohemian nationality diverged from the other three nations upon religious questions, which had entirely occupied the attention of the clergy since the days of Charles IV. The German preacher Conrad Waldhauser, whom Charles had summoned from Austria to Prague, then supported the Czech Milicz of Kremsier in his crusade against the immorality of laity and clergy. They both died during Charles's reign, and the activity of their successors became rather nationalist than religious, and was directed on the one hand against the German mendicant Orders,—the Dominicans and Augustinians—and on the other against the upper clergy, the Archbishop of Prague and the chapter.

Wenzel became involved in the quarrel, and treated the Archbishop of Prague, Johann von Jenstein, and his officials with undue severity. In the course of the conflict they were taken prisoners, examined under torture, and severely punished; one of them, Doctor Johann von Pomuk, otherwise Nepomuk, who had been so brutally mishandled as to be past all hope

The King's Punishment of Officials

of recovery, was drowned in the Moldau at the king's orders. This happened in the year 1393. In the very next year the king was to discover the weakness of the foundations supporting the power which he exercised with such despotism in Bohemia. The most distinguished noble families formed a confederacy with the object of overthrowing the king's advisers and of recovering their former rights to a share in the administration.

Their enterprise was especially dangerous to Wenzel, for the reason that they had secured the support of the king's cousin Jost, the margrave of Moravia. Jost, whose personality is henceforward of considerable importance in the history of Wenzel's reign, had been margrave and overlord of Moravia since the death of his father John in 1375. Important estates had been bequeathed to his two brothers, who were independent of Jost. But no love was lost between them from the outset, and the enmity between Jost and Procop resulted in a furious struggle between the brothers in Moravia, which caused great suffering for a long period to the whole margraviate, and especially to the bishopric of Olmütz. Jost, an ambitious and capable character, succeeded in securing the confidence of the self-mistrustful King of Bohemia, and was allowed to assume part of his imperial duties in return for an adequate consideration.

To begin with, he was appointed in 1383 vicar of the empire for Italy, as Wenzel hoped that his cousin would clear

Aristocrats Oppose Wenzel

his way for a progress to Rome. In return for the military and pecuniary help which he gave to Wenzel and Sigismund in the Hungarian War, Jost obtained the Mark of Brandenburg on mortgage in 1388; to this were soon added Luxemburg and the governorship of Alsace. When Wenzel first—about 1387—entertained the idea of abdicating the German crown, he had thoughts of transferring it to his Moravian cousin. Jost had serious hopes of securing that dignity, as is proved by the fact that in 1389 he concluded compacts with Duke Albert III., "in the event of his becoming king of Germany." The plan, however, came to nothing. In the year 1390 Jost was again appointed imperial vicar for Italy, with a view to the more serious consideration of the papal question and the crowning of Wenzel as emperor.

The margrave, however, was induced to decline the honour by reason of the outbreak of disturbances in Bohemia, and personally took the lead of the aristocratic league against the king, and secured for this movement the support of King Sigismund of Hungary, Duke Albert of Austria, and the Margrave William of Meissen. Wenzel was able to rely only upon the humble resources of his cousin Procop

BOHEMIA AND THE REFORMATION

of Moravia and of his youngest brother, John of Görlitz. But before hostilities were actually begun the confederates succeeded in capturing the king's person on May 8th, 1394. His two allies attempted to rescue him, the sole result being that Wenzel was confined first in a Bohemian and afterwards in an Austrian castle. Meanwhile Jost administered the government of Bohemia. Germany then began to menace the conspirators, who liberated the king. A war broke out in Bohemia and Moravia which seemed likely to be prolonged by the weakness of Wenzel and the mutual animosity of the several members of the royal family.

At the outset Sigismund, king of Hungary, drove his cousin Jost out of he field by the conclusion of a secret reconciliation with his brother Wenzel, whereby he secured the office of Vicar General in Germany in March, 1396, with the reversion of the German crown. About a year later—in February, 1397—Wenzel in turn made peace with Jost and allowed him to establish a kind of co-regency in Prague.

Suddenly, however, he renounced his compact with Jost and summoned Procop to be his permanent adviser in 1398; this, too, at a time when the temper of the German electors had grown threatening owing to the weakness of Wenzel's government. Wenzel then betook himself to Germany, held a diet in Frankfort in 1398, and travelled thence to Charles VI. of France to discuss the difficult problem of allaying the papal schism. Meanwhile, the federated nobles, supported by Jost and Sigismund, began war in Bohemia against Wenzel and Procop. The struggle continued until the end of August, 1400, when

**The Nobles
Depose
King Wenzel**

Wenzel received the news of his own deposition and of the election of Rupert of the Palatinate as king of the Romans. Wenzel was naturally furious at the insult. He could not, however, summon up resolution to strike an immediate blow for the recovery of his position. He made a second attempt at reconciliation with Sigismund; but the brothers again quarrelled concerning the conditions under which the King of Hungary should take up

arms against the empire on behalf of Wenzel, and Sigismund reluctantly retired to Bohemia. Jost seized the opportunity for a decisive stroke. In alliance with the Bohemian barons, the Archbishop of Prague, and the Margrave of Meissen he forced Wenzel to accept a regency for Bohemia, and again secured his possession

**Restless
Times in
Hungary**

of Lausitz and of the Brandenburg Mark in August, 1401. Wenzel was anxious to put an end to this tutelage; for this purpose he again concluded a compact with Sigismund at the beginning of 1402, appointing him vice-regent or co-regent in Bohemia, and conferring on him the imperial vicariate for Germany. The King of Hungary repaid this mark of confidence by making Wenzel a prisoner in March, 1402, and by capturing shortly afterwards his most faithful supporter,

the margrave Procop. Sigismund entered upon relations of extreme intimacy with the Austrian dukes, entrusted them with the care of the person of the Bohemian king in August, 1402, and concluded with them important pacts of inheritance, considerably to the disadvantage of Jost of Moravia, whose Mark of Brandenburg he treated as his own.

The position was at length entirely changed by a rising in Hungary which obliged Sigismund to abandon

Bohemia, and by the flight of Wenzel from Austria to his own country in November, 1403, where he was received with much jubilation, owing to the general hatred of the Austrian rule. Jost was reconciled to Wenzel, chiefly for the reason that his brother Procop, with whom he had been in continual hostility, had died in the year 1405, and the attacks of Sigismund and the Hapsburgs upon the Bohemian king were successfully repulsed. Southern Bohemia, Moravia, and Austria suffered terrible devastation between 1404 and 1406 from the wars between the princes and also from the ravages of the dangerous robber bands which then became the curse of the country.

Silesia suffered no less than Bohemia and Moravia under the unhappy government of King Wenzel. At the outset of his reign he interfered in a violent quarrel



JOHN HUSS, REFORMER
The leading representative of the Reformation among the Bohemian clergy died a martyr in 1415.

between Breslau and the local chapter, and espoused the cause of the town against the despotic aggression of its opponents in 1381. Shortly afterwards he involved this important commercial centre in a long feud with the dukes of Oppeln upon the question of a heavy guarantee for the king's financial necessities. In the course

Silesian Princes at the Bohemian Court of this struggle the travelling merchants of Breslau suffered heavy losses in property and purse. Some of the Silesian princes, in particular those of Teschen, remained faithful to Wenzel and secured high offices at the Bohemian court; others, however, broke their feudal ties with Bohemia and formed connections with Vladislav Jagellon, the reigning king of Poland.

These numerous indications of retrogression and decay in the hereditary Luxemburg territories would perhaps have been less ominous had not the religious and nationalist movement among the Bohemian nation then attained its highest point, declaring war with terrible determination both against the Catholic Church and against German influence in general. The best-known representative of the reform movement among the Bohemian clergy is John Huss; he had been a leading figure among the lecturers at the university since 1396, and as preacher in the Bethlehem chapel at Prague he enjoyed an unexampled popularity among all classes of the population. He and his followers fulminated in the Bohemian language against the immorality of clergy and laity, especially against the sale of ecclesiastical offices (simony), whereby the ranks of the clergy were filled with unworthy members. Livings and benefices had been multiplied to such an extent in Bohemia and Moravia that even small churches supported numerous priests in idleness. These and other evils formed a widespread social malady of the period,

Bohemia During the Reformation and as early as the middle of the fourteenth century had been combated by Waldhauser and Milicz in Bohemia, and by John Wycliffe in England. Nowhere, however, did these ecclesiastical quarrels fall upon a soil so rich in national animosities as in Bohemia. The war broke out upon the question of the condemnation of Wycliffe's writings, which had made their way into Bohemia and were enthusiastically received by the reform

party among the clergy. The cathedral chapter requested the university to oppose the dissemination of Wycliffe's works and opinions; they met with a refusal from the Bohemian "nation" in the university which was practically led by Huss. The breach existing in the university and within the nation was widened.

The same opposition reappeared a few years later upon the question of concluding the papal schism. The Council of Pisa in 1409 proposed to settle the question definitely by observing an ecclesiastical neutrality and refusing obedience to either Pope. In the University of Prague the idea commended itself only to the Bohemian "nation;" the three remaining nationalities in conjunction with the upper clergy adhered firmly to the Roman Pope Gregory XII. King Wenzel, in contrast to Rupert, declared for ecclesiastical neutrality, and the Czech party induced him to issue that fatal decree whereby the Bohemian "nation," though in the minority, was henceforward to have three votes in all university discussions and resolutions, while the three non-Bohemian

Huss Defies the Pope nations were to have but one vote between them. This measure implied the despotic repression of Germans and foreigners. Their sole remedy was migration to other German universities.

Huss, who must be regarded as the prime mover in this momentous transaction, had shaken off his opponents with unusual success. He was the more emboldened for the struggle with the higher clergy, in particular with Archbishop Zhynek of Prague. This ecclesiastic had forcibly deprived the clergy of their Wycliffite books, which he condemned to be burnt, and had also taken measures against the licence of the preachers in every direction, and was anxious to confine their activity to the parish churches. When Huss declined to obey these regulations and continued to preach reform from the pulpit of the Bethlehem chapel, he was excommunicated. However, the bulk of the population, the university, the court, the Queen Sophie—Wenzel's second wife from 1389—and the king himself, were on the side of Huss, while the archbishop was supported only by his clergy and by the new Pope, John XXIII.

The further development of these divisions was largely influenced by general political events. King Rupert had died



JOHN HUSS, THE GREAT HOHEMIAN REFORMER BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE WHICH CONDEMNED HIM TO DEATH N 14

in the year 1410. The simultaneous choice of the two Luxemburg princes, Jost of Moravia and Sigismund of Hungary, was but a temporary danger, as the former died in January, 1411. Of the many descendants of the house of Luxemburg there remained only King Wenzel of Bohemia and King Sigismund of Hungary, neither having male issue. They agreed without difficulty to share the inheritance of their Moravian cousin, and laid aside all previous grounds of dispute. Sigismund took the Mark of Brandenburg, which he forthwith mortgaged to the Burgrave Frederic of Nuremberg; Wenzel added Moravia and Lausitz to Bohemia. Sigismund was then unanimously chosen king of Germany. Wenzel reserved to himself the right of acquiring the dignity of emperor at the hands of the Pope. They attempted by similar means to conclude the schism in the Church, recognising John XXIII., then resident in Rome, as against the other two candidates who laid claim to the papal tiara. Hopes of a general recognition induced the Pope to modify his attitude to Huss and to refrain from summoning him to Rome; this policy was the more feasible because the chief opponent of Huss, the Archbishop Zbynek, died in the year 1411, and his aged successor was a mere tool in the hands of King Wenzel. Huss, however, was stimulated to further invective in his preaching against ecclesiastical abuses by John XXIII.'s issue of indulgences to secure money for the struggle against his opponents, a proceeding which gave further ground for serious complaints. Once again the nation supported Huss, with his pupils and friends. On this occasion, however, Wenzel resolved to give vigorous support, for political reasons, to the minority who opposed reform. The result was the imprisonment and execution of certain persons who publicly opposed the proceedings of the papal commissioners, while further complaints were made in Rome against Huss, who consequently incurred a papal sentence of excommunication in 1412. Huss retired from Prague, but continued his work

throughout the country with increased zeal, while in the capital itself the tension between the two parties was in no degree diminished.

Sigismund then considered that it might be possible to make an end of the religious disputes which shook the Bohemian hereditary lands, Bohemia itself, and also Moravia, to their centre, by bringing Huss before the Council of Constance, where the most influential representatives of political and ecclesiastical Europe had gathered to conclude the schism and to introduce general measures of church reform. Huss arrived a fortnight before the first sitting of the council, on November 3rd, 1414, accompanied by several Bohemian nobles, under a safe-conduct from Sigismund. This fact, however,

Huss dies a Martyr did not prevent the council from imprisoning Huss on November 28th. Sigismund and Wenzel made no attempt to interfere, in spite of their express promise guaranteeing a safe passage and return for Huss. The nobility of Bohemia and Moravia pressed his case with increasing firmness, and sent letters of warning to the king and the council; but after more than six months' imprisonment in misery, Huss was deprived of his spiritual office as an arch-heretic by the council on July 6th, 1415, and the secular power then executed the sentence of death by burning.

Huss died a true martyr to his religious zeal. The firmness, the love of truth, and the contempt of death which he displayed before his judges at Constance, were a powerful incitement to his strong body of adherents in Bohemia and Moravia to cling the more tenaciously to his doctrines. Shortly before his death, his pupil, Jacobel-

ius of Mies, came forward with a claim, based upon the commands of Holy Scripture, for communion in both kinds. Huss offered no objection, and his followers thus gained, to their great advantage, a tangible symbol of their divergence from the Catholic Church.

No priest was tolerated who would not dispense the sacrament in both kinds; and since the Council of Constance



A HUSSITE MARTYR
Jerome, or Hieronymus, of Prague was one of the Hussite reformers who suffered death in the year 1410.



LUTHER AND HUSS ADMINISTERING THE COMMUNION TO JOHN FREDERIC I. OF SAXONY
 Reproduced from an old print illustrating allegorically the triumph of the lay communion, in support of which, and for other "heresies," Huss had been martyred seventy years before the time of Luther.

rejected this innovation as being opposed to the existing custom of the Church, occasion was given for the expulsion of the Catholic clergy in every direction. Nobles and knights, in accordance with the custom of the age, soon formed a league for the purpose of protecting communion in both kinds and freedom of preaching in the country. They were unanimously resolved to regard the University of Prague and not the Council of Constance as their supreme ecclesiastical authority until the choice of a new Pope.

Strong measures were taken against the apostates; the fathers of the council issued excommunications and an interdict without delay. Hussite disciples were burned in Olmütz when they attempted to preach the new doctrine in that city. A second magister of Prague, Hieronymus, was burned in Constance on May 30th, 1416. Bishop John of Leitomischl, who was regarded as chiefly responsible next to Sigismund for the condemnation of Huss, was made Bishop of Olmütz, and showed great zeal for the extirpation of the heresy.

But these measures served only to intensify the spirit of opposition, after the death of Huss, from year to year, and soon made the breach irremediable. The only measures which commended themselves to the new Pope, Martin V., were excommunication and anathema, which produced the smaller effect, as the

Hussites Break Up into Sects Hussites themselves now began to break up into sects and parties, which went far beyond the doctrine of the magister of Prague. The most numerous, and afterwards the most important, of these sects was that of the Taborites, who took their name from Mount Tabor, where they originally held their meetings. As regarded religion, they professed a return to the conditions of primitive Christianity, and adherence only to the actual letter of the Bible. At the same time their political and social views and objects were marked by extreme radicalism. The more moderate opposition among the Hussites were known from their symbol as Calixtins (chalicemen) or as Pragers, as the Prague school was their spiritual centre.

King Wenzel, who had favoured the Hussites since the condemnation of their founder, was impelled by his brother Sigismund and the Pope to entertain seriously the idea of interference, in view of the dangerous and revolutionary spirit which animated an ever increasing circle of adherents. At the outset of the year 1419 he remodelled the Hussite council of the Neustadt in Prague by introducing Catholics, and recalled the priests who had been expelled. However, mutual animosities had risen to such a pitch that on July 30th, 1419, when the Catholics disturbed or insulted a procession, the Hussites, under their leader Ziska, stormed the parliament house in the Neustadt and threw some of the Catholic councillors out of the windows. The councillors were then beaten and stabbed to death by the infuriated populace. The excitement in the

Wenzel Dies in an Access of Fury city and the country was increased a few weeks afterwards by the sudden death of King Wenzel on August 19th, 1419, the consequence of a fearful access of fury at the outbreak of the revolution.

Sigismund, the last descendant of the house of Luxemburg, was now confronted with the difficult task of securing his accession to the heritage of his brother—Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia. In each of these

three countries the political situation and the prospects of his recognition were different. In Bohemia he might expect a bitter opposition, as long as he maintained his hostility to the Hussite movement. In Moravia this movement had indeed obtained a firm footing among the nobility and the population. Here, however, there was a counteracting force in the bishopric of Olmütz and its numerous feudatories, led by Bishop John, "the man of iron," who strove vigorously for the suppression of the heresy. Further, the most important towns, such as Brünn, Olmütz, Znaim, Iglau, and others were populated by a majority of Catholic and German inhabitants, and neither they nor the nobility had any intention of opposing the rights of the Luxemburg claimant.

Finally, Sigismund could be certain of meeting with ready submission in Silesia, which was entirely Germanised, and regarded the struggle in Bohemia primarily from a nationalist point of view, condemning it for its anti-German tendency. Hence Sigismund did not enter Bohemia, but entrusted the government to the Dowager-queen Sophie, and to some councillors from the moderates among the nobility; he appeared in Brünn in December, 1419, where he summoned the provincial assembly. An embassy also appeared from Bohemia to ask for the king's recognition of the four articles of belief, which had been drawn up by the Hussite sects a short time previously in a general assembly at Prague. These were, firstly, freedom of preaching; secondly, communion in both kinds; thirdly, the observance of apostolic poverty by the clergy; and, fourthly, the suppression and punishment of deadly sins. Sigismund, however, declined to declare his position, and put off the deputies until he should arrive in Bohemia itself.

He did not, however, proceed to Bohemia, but hurried immediately from Brünn to Breslau, into which town he made a formal entry on January 5th, 1420. Here he declared his real attitude towards the Hussites as his religious and political opponents. Towards the close of Wenzel's reign the artisans of Breslau had raised a revolt against the aristocratic council and the whole system of royal administration, following the example of the Hussites at Prague, who had killed councillors and

BOHEMIA AND THE REFORMATION

usurped the power and authority. Sigismund did not hesitate to bring the revolutionaries to justice; he executed twenty-three of them in the public square on March 4th, 1420, condemned the numerous fugitives to death, declared their rights and property forfeit, and most strictly limited the freedom and the privileges of the guilds as a whole.

This action was intended as a menace to the Bohemians, and its meaning became plainer on March 15th, 1420, when a citizen of Prague, who had ventured to express publicly in Breslau his opinion upon the condemnation of Huss, and to declare himself a Hussite, was burned as a heretic at Sigismund's orders. Two days afterwards he ordered the crusade bull against the Hussites which Pope Martin V. had issued, to be read from the pulpits of the Breslau churches. The embassy from Prague, which had also come to Breslau to negotiate with the king, naturally left the city entirely undeceived, and upon its return to Prague wisely advised a union of the moderate Calixtins and radical Taborites, and issued an appeal for war upon their common enemy, the Luxemburg ruler.

A few weeks later Sigismund entered Bohemia with a strong army, composed chiefly of Germans and Silesians. He could calculate upon the support of many towns which had remained German and Catholic—for example, Kuttenberg—and on the advantage derived from the possession of the two fortresses which dominated Prague—the Hradshin and the Wysherad. However, the siege of Prague from May to June, 1420, was a failure. An attempt to relieve the defenders of the Wysherad was defeated, and in the murderous battle of November 1st, 1420, the king's army was shattered, and many of the Catholic nobility of Moravia who had followed him were included in the overthrow. In February, 1421, Sigismund again made trial of his fortune in war against Bohemia, and was forced to retreat, or rather to flee,

through Moravia to Hungary. On all three occasions the undaunted Taborite army had held the field under its general, Ziska. Conscious of their power, the Taborites now took the offensive, and conquered during the following months a number of towns and fiefs which had remained Catholic. The process of transforming the German towns of Bohemia into Czech settlements went on simultaneously with these conquests, so far as it had not been already completed by earlier events. A few towns only were able to resist the change. In June, 1421, the assembly of

Caslau had already declared the crown to be forfeit, the king being "the deadly enemy of the Bohemian nation." The provisional government offered the Bohemian throne to the King of Poland.

Sigismund was a restless and undaunted character; in this and in many other good and bad qualities he reminds us of his grandfather, King John. Once again he resumed the struggle, although the dangers which threatened him in Hungary made it impossible for him to think of continuing the war in Bohemia without foreign help. Germany equipped a crusading army at his appeal, increased, it is said, to 200,000 men by contingents from Meissen and Silesia. Bohemia was invaded in September, 1421, but the furious attacks of the Hussite bands inflicted heavy loss, and forced the

army to withdraw almost as soon as it had crossed the frontier. It was not for several years that the empire undertook any fresh military enterprise against Bohemia.

Most important to Sigismund were the support and co-operation of Duke Albert V. of Austria, which were continued from the beginning to the end of the war. The price paid for this help was, indeed, considerable. Sigismund gave Elizabeth, his only child and heiress, to the duke, in marriage, ceded certain towns and castles, and afterwards gave him the governorship, and finally complete possession, of the margraviate of Moravia under



A BOHEMIAN WARRIOR
In fifteenth-century chain armour.

the convention of October 1st to 4th, 1423. Albert was gradually able, with the help of the Bishop of Olmütz, to withdraw this province from Hussite influence, to crush the Hussite barons, and to make the province a base of operations against Moravia. These facts induced Ziska to turn his attention to the neighbouring

Quarrels Among the Hussites province in the year 1424; but at the outset of the campaign this great general succumbed to an attack of

some kind of plague at Pribislau, a little town on the frontier of Bohemia and Moravia, on October 11th, 1424. Before his death bitter quarrels had broken out between the several Hussite sects, though these had hitherto been allayed by Ziska. However, after his death an irremediable disruption took place. His special adherents, who were known as the "Orphans," separated from the Taborites. The leadership of the latter was undertaken by Prokop Holy (Rasa, the shorn one), who took a leading position in the general Hussite army during the warfare of the following years. He was the chief stimulus to the enterprises which the Bohemians undertook after 1424 against all the neighbouring provinces, and he spread the Hussite wars to Austria and Hungary, to Silesia and the Lausitz, to Saxony and Brandenburg, to the Palatinate and Franconia.

The Hussite expeditions were repeated annually, now in one direction, now in another, spreading terrible misery throughout the whole of Central Europe. In many countries, especially in Silesia, the Hussites were not content with mere raids, but left permanent garrisons in the conquered towns and castles, which incessantly harassed and devastated the surrounding districts. To such a height did the danger rise that the princes of the empire were induced to undertake a second crusade against Bohemia in the

Hussites Put German Army to Flight summer of 1427, while King Sigismund was occupied with the war against the Turks.

Once again the enterprise ended with the panic and flight of the German army when confronted at Tachau by the Hussites, whom a long series of victories had filled with hope and confidence. It seemed absolutely impossible to subdue this enemy in the field, and the opinion was further strengthened by the Hussite exploits in the following years.

The last act of this tragic period of Bohemian history began at the outset of the year 1431. Sigismund attempted to reach a solution of the problem at any cost on wholly new principles; a council had begun the war, a council should end it. He succeeded in winning over to his view Pope Martin V., who summoned a general council of the Church at Basle, and entrusted the conduct of it to the cardinal Giuliano Cesarini, with instructions to make the suppression of the Hussite movement a chief topic of debate.

This expedition to Bohemia ended, like its predecessors, with a terrible defeat of the Germans at Taus on August 14th, 1431; and negotiations were then attempted, to which, indeed, more moderate parties in Bohemia had long since manifested their inclination. While the Hussite armies in 1432 and 1433 marched plundering and massacring through Austria, North Hungary, Silesia, Saxony, and Brandenburg

Death of Sigismund to the Baltic, an embassy from Prague appeared in Basle during the first months of 1433. When no conclusion could be reached there, the ambassadors of the council betook themselves to Prague, and concluded, on November 30th, 1433, the Compactata of Prague. The material point was the recognition—though under conditions and incompletely—of the four articles of Prague of 1419; concerning the acceptance or refusal of these King Sigismund, then in Brünn, had declined to commit himself.

Of decisive importance for further developments was the split between the moderate Calixtins, who included the majority of the Bohemian nobility, and the Taborites and Orphans. The dissension ended in a conflict at Lipan in Bohemia on May 30th, 1434, when the radicals suffered a severe defeat. The path was now cleared for peace, which was concluded on July 5th, 1436, by the publication of the Compactata at the assembly of Iglau. The reconciliation of the Bohemians with the Church was followed by a further reconciliation with King Sigismund, who was then recognised as king of Bohemia. Only for a year and a half did he enjoy the peaceful possession of this throne. On December 9th, 1437, he died, after numerous misunderstandings and breaches of the terms of peace had begun to rouse strong feeling against him among the Hussites.



BOHEMIA'S ELECTIVE MONARCHY AND ITS UNION WITH HUNGARY AND AUSTRIA

ON his death-bed Sigismund recommended his son-in-law, Duke Albert of Austria, as his successor to the choice of the Bohemian nobles who stood round him. Albert II. inherited both the German and the Hungarian crown from Sigismund; his claim to Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia was based upon the principles formulated under the Emperor Charles IV. to regulate the succession in the house of Luxemburg, and also upon the various succession treaties and marriage connections between the Luxemburg and Hapsburg families. However, the prince, whom the Hussite wars had made conspicuous in Bohemia, could secure recognition from only two of the parties then dominant in the country, the Catholics, led by Baron Ulrich of Rosenberg, and the Calixtins, whose spokesman was Meinhard of Neuhaus. The Taborites, who were then guided by Henry Ptacek of Pirkstein, offered the crown of Bohemia to a Slavonic prince, Casimir, the brother of Vladislav, king of Poland; their action brought about a civil war in Bohemia itself, as well as a Polish invasion both of this country and of Silesia, which had already done homage to Albert.

While this struggle was in progress, Albert suddenly died on October 27th, 1439, leaving no male issue. Not until February, 1440, did his widow Elizabeth bear a son, who was named Ladislaus (Vladislav IV.) Posthumus. Though this prince enjoyed, beyond the shadow of a doubt, his father's justifiable claims to the inheritance, yet the party of Ptacek of Pirkstein passed over the Hapsburg claim and secured, by an almost unanimous vote in the assembly of Prague, the choice of Albert, Duke of Bavaria, as king of Bohemia; he, however, declined the honour under the influence of a secret warning from Ulrich von Rosenberg, the leader of the Catholics. The Taborites then attempted to induce the Emperor

Frederick, the uncle and guardian of Ladislaus, to accept the crown of Bohemia. When this plan failed, they professed their readiness to recognise Ladislaus himself, provided that he were brought up in Bohemia. During these endless party struggles Ulrich of Rosenberg kept the upper hand. He was the most powerful of the Bohemian nobles, and derived the greatest advantages from the confusion which prevailed during his interregnum. The greater part of the country and the capital, Prague, were in his power and in that of his allies, the Calixtins; the Taborites were restricted to four only of the thirteen circles of Bohemia.

The position was changed after the death of Ptacek of Pirkstein in 1444, when the youthful George Podiebrad and Kunstadt undertook the leadership of the advanced Hussite party. In the year 1448 he seized Prague by a bold and sudden attack, and there assisted his party to gain a complete victory. For two years civil war again raged in Bohemia, until the close of the year 1450, when it was agreed at the general assembly at Prague to approach the emperor again upon the question of the surrender of the young king. On this occasion Frederick III. came to an understanding by direct negotiation with George Podiebrad; without consulting the other party leaders. In 1451 he entrusted Podiebrad with the regency in Bohemia during the minority of Ladislaus. The Bohemian estates confirmed this decision at the assembly of April 24th, 1452. Podiebrad, moreover, adhered to these conditions. When a revolution of the Austrian nobility against the emperor broke out in the following year, Ladislaus was released from his position as a minor and, in name at least, became king of Austria, Hungary and Bohemia. In October, 1453, the memorable year of the Turkish conquest

of Constantinople, he came to Prague and was crowned king of Bohemia, after a progress through Moravia, where he previously received the homage of the Moravian nobility, to the very considerable vexation of the Bohemians. In Bohemia

King Dies on the Eve of Marriage the young prince was entirely dependent upon George Podiebrad, who was not only the prince's minister and political adviser, but also his "major-domo," as he called himself, and he never allowed the youth to be out of his sight. He kept the prince in Bohemia for more than a year, and then accompanied him to Breslau and Vienna.

Then at length the Bohemian governor left Ladislaus to return home and continue the government of the country in the name of the king. George Podiebrad was well able to turn the king's favour to his own advantage, and was richly rewarded with fiefs from the royal domains; none the less the period of his governorship in Bohemia (1451-1457) was a period of prosperity. He succeeded in preserving domestic peace, securing general safety and order, and advancing the progress of trade and manufacture. Then, at the age of barely eighteen, the king suddenly died in Prague on November 23rd, 1457, from an illness akin to the plague, at the moment when preparations were being made for the celebration of his marriage with the daughter of Charles VII. of France.

So admirable had been the preparations of George Podiebrad, that on March 2nd, 1458, a few months after the death of Ladislaus, he was able to secure his elevation to the crown of Bohemia. The neighbouring provinces of Moravia, Silesia, and in particular the powerful Breslau and Lausitz, at first refused obedience or recognition. Eventually, however, submission to the Hussite king was refused in Moravia only by the Catholic towns—Brünn, Olmütz, Znaim, Iglau and others. When George invaded the country with an army, Iglau alone

proved obstinate, trusting to the support of the Archduke Albert VI. of Austria, a brother of the Emperor Frederick III., until its resistance met with a bloody punishment. In Silesia and Lausitz a revulsion in favour of George took place, when he succeeded, as a result of many tortuous intrigues, in ousting the local claimant to the throne, Duke Albert the Courageous of Saxony.

The firmness of George's position was largely due to the fact that, strangely enough, before his coronation in Bohemia he had promised obedience to the Catholic Church, and had thereby secured the powerful support of the Pope, who expected that Podiebrad would bring the whole of Bohemia into submission to Rome,

and had therefore ordered the Catholics of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia to do homage to the new king. Breslau was isolated and unable to persist in its attitude of hostility to George, when Pope Pius II. (Æneas Sylvius) sent his legates to the city in 1459 to arrange a reconciliation with the King of Bohemia. On January 13th, 1460, the intervention of the Breslau city chronicler and historian Peter Eschenloer secured the acceptance of an important agreement, whereby the citizens of Breslau promised obedience to King George, though the actual



ALBERT II. OF GERMANY

He inherited the German and Hungarian crowns from Sigismund, but died in October, 1439, before he had secured general recognition as ruler of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia.

performance of homage was postponed for three years.

Secure of his power in Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, on the best of terms with all the neighbouring states and with the German Emperor, designated "most beloved son" by the papal chair, George was able to turn his attention to higher objects.

Podiebrad Refuses the Crown of Hungary

The prospect of establishing himself upon the throne of Hungary in opposition to Matthias Corvinus, had been offered to him or to his son Henry in the year 1459. In view, however, of the equivocal nature of the situation in Hungary, he had hesitated, and had finally declined the crown, which then fell to Frederick III. Podiebrad found some

BOHEMIA'S ELECTIVE MONARCHY

compensation in the fact that the two princes who were struggling for the throne respectively sought alliance with him from this time onwards. In August, 1459, the emperor invested him with the Bohemian lands, and also made him other important promises; at the same time Matthias made a successful effort to secure the favour of the Bohemian king. Not only did George succeed in turning the hostility of the two princes to his own advantage, but he also conceived the plan of entering into relations with the enemies of the emperor within the empire, and thus advancing towards the imperial crown without the help of foreign intervention. This project of the King of Bohemia was rendered abortive chiefly by the opposition of Albert Achilles, the Margrave of Brandenburg.

A short time afterwards occurred that breach with the papacy which had such momentous consequences for George, and a short period of triumphant progress was followed by almost a decade of fruitless and exhausting struggle. Pius II. insisted upon the performance of the undertaking which George had given in his coronation oath, to adopt strong measures against the Hussites. When negotiation produced no result, the Pope sent his legates to Prague in the summer of 1462. There, on August 14th, a violent scene took place, when King George publicly replied to the Pope's demands by asserting his refusal to recede from the Compactata, which Pius II. had already declared invalid. The legates accused the king of faithlessness before the public assembly, threatened him with spiritual and temporal punishment, and were forthwith imprisoned. By this act every tie between the Pope and the king was broken. For the moment, however, the struggle was confined to attempts to induce the Catholics in Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia to abandon the king's cause; only in Breslau did these exhortations produce any appreciable effect. The princes to whom the Pope

appealed against George Podiebrad declined to take any share in a crusade, partly for reasons of family relationship—(for example, his son-in-law, Matthias Corvinus of Hungary), partly for political reasons (for example, the King of Poland, and especially the Emperor Frederic III., who was very hard pressed in the years 1462 and 1463).

The New Pope Excommunicates King George

The emperor even attempted to intervene with the Pope on behalf of George Podiebrad.

In 1464 the situation changed. Paul II., a far more vigorous character than Pius II., occupied the papal chair, while the death of Katherina, the daughter of George Podiebrad, left her husband Matthias

Corvinus free to act against his former father-in-law. In 1466 Paul excommunicated George as a heretic, and stirred up war against him in Breslau and Moravia. The Catholic federation of nobles soon made their hostility felt in Bohemia also. However, the king maintained the upper hand against his adversaries in his own country, as long as the rulers of the neighbouring territories held aloof. Only when Matthias of Hungary resolved in 1468 to obey the papal command for a crusade against the Bohemian king, did George lose almost the whole of



GEORGIUS VI. REX BOHEM.
PODIEBRAD, THE HUSSITE KING
George Podiebrad, who was one of the leaders of the Hussite party, was a statesman of great ability, whose plans were so well laid that on the death of Ladislaus he was able to secure the throne of Bohemia. He died in the year 1470.

Moravia and part of Silesia. However, he soon succeeded in surrounding at Wilmow the Hungarian king, who had advanced too rashly in February, 1469, and Matthias was forced to agree to an armistice with a view to arranging terms of peace. Peace, however, proved impossible in view of the terms demanded by the papal legate and the Bohemian barons, which George could not possibly accept. They even induced Matthias Corvinus to proclaim himself king of Bohemia on May 3rd, 1469, and to receive the homage of Moravia, Silesia and Lausitz.

The natural result was the continuation of the war. George had secured the support of Poland—in return for an

acknowledgment of the Polish prince Vladislav as his successor—and fought with some success; he did not live to see the conclusion of the struggle, in the midst of which he died of an illness on March 22nd, 1471. He had been one of the most extraordinary figures on the throne of Bohemia; neither before nor

Death of the Hussite King

afterwards did the country see a prince of such humble origin, who rose from the position of a simple party leader to that of viceroy with full powers, and thence to the throne. He had remarkable capacity for government, and found enthusiastic admirers and true friends among his contemporaries. During his reign his territory was in a continual state of war, but the administration was in strong hands. But the religious problem, a bequest from the Hussite period, thwarted his success and undermined the whole of his efforts.

A wholly different character from George was his successor on the Bohemian throne, the Pole Vladislav, who was known as "King Allright," from a favourite and very characteristic expression of his. The war against King Matthias continued for eight years longer, partly on the soil of Bohemia and Moravia, partly in Silesia (Breslau) and partly in Hungary. Fortune favoured now one side and now the other, until financial embarrassments affecting both princes and parties, and the steady approach of the Turkish danger, paved the way for a temporary armistice and eventually for a peace, which was concluded after lengthy negotiations at Olmütz on July 21st, 1479. It was agreed that Vladislav should remain in possession of the title and the kingdom of Bohemia, and that Matthias Corvinus should bear the title of King of Bohemia during his life, and should also remain in possession of Moravia, Silesia, and Lausitz; after his death his provinces might be bought

Catholics and Hussites Come to Terms

back by Vladislav for 400,000 ducats, an exorbitant price for that period. No reference was made to the question of religious unity, or to the bringing back of the Hussites to the Catholic Church, though it was with this object that Rome had stirred up the struggle. Even before his accession King Vladislav had pledged himself to maintain the Compactata. Thus it was inevitable that upon the conclusion of the foreign war the party

struggle between the Catholics and the Hussites should break out again in Bohemia. The movement degenerated into fearful confusion after the autumn of 1483. Councillors were murdered and flung through windows; churches and monasteries were plundered; Germans and Jews were persecuted and robbed as a matter of course. Strangely enough, however, this violent outburst of passion resulted in less than two years in a reconciliation of the two parties (1485); and an agreement was arranged upon the basis of the recognition of the Compactata and of the full equality of the Hussites with the Catholics.

From that moment the influence of the Hussite sect in Bohemia began to diminish. It lost importance the more rapidly as the "Bohemian Brotherhood," which was originally in some connection with it, began a vigorous period of development. The fact that the descendants of the original Hussites were able at this late period to develop a branch of a new doctrine with such vigour, is evidence of the hold which the Hussite theories had

Rise and Fall of Religious Sects

gained upon the nation; hence the futility of the many attempts, initiated by Rome, at union between the Hussites and the Catholics of Bohemia, notwithstanding the fact that men of such power as Nicholas of Cusa, John of Capistrano, and Æneas Sylvius applied their energy to the task. An extraordinarily large number of sects rose and disappeared in the course of the fifteenth century, side by side with the main groups in Bohemia and Moravia. Only the Brotherhood became of permanent importance; this sect began with a society of certain members who were dissatisfied with the Hussite doctrine, and its first settlement was made in 1457 at Runwald, a Bohemian village belonging to King George Podiebrad. The society incurred its share of persecution and martyrdom; its most vigorous opponents were a relation of its founder, Gregor, John of Rokitzan, and the king himself. Nevertheless, they possessed and acquired, even during this period, a wide body of adherents both in Bohemia and Moravia, and the death of these two powerful oppressors, in the year 1471, relieved the brethren of a severe hindrance, especially in Bohemia. The expansion of the sect was never seriously checked, either by its internal quarrels and dissen-

BOHEMIA'S ELECTIVE MONARCHY

sions, or by the general decree of banishment from Moravia which its members incurred in 1480.

The difference in the treatment of the Brotherhood in Bohemia and in Moravia was due to the separation of this latter country and also of Silesia from the Bohemian crown, and to the wholly different policy followed by Vladislav in Bohemia and by Matthias in Moravia and Silesia. The weakness and good nature of the former allowed the supremacy to fall into the hands of the nobles. Matthias, on the other hand, emphasised from the very outset his royal power as opposed to the claims of the privileged orders. The iron hand of Corvinus was even more strongly felt in Silesia, than in Moravia, where Matthias left the government in the hands of the highly capable viceroy Ctibor of Tumburg, who had been occupant of this high position from 1469, retaining it until 1494, long after the death of Matthias.

It is due chiefly to Ctibor that the attempts which had been made during the past century to unite the divided principalities were now consummated by means of a definitely organised administration. The institution of the princely diets and the creation of the central bureaucracy belong to the age of Matthias, and are his work. His government did not enjoy the best of reputations with posterity, owing to the enormous increase in the taxes and imposts, which his continual financial necessities laid upon his subjects; in this matter he was supported, especially in Silesia, by his local governor, George von Stein, and by other faithful servants, in the most irresponsible manner, at the expense of the people.

On April 6th, 1490, Matthias died without legitimate issue, and the Bohemian king, Vladislav, was raised to the throne

of Hungary. In accordance with the previous arrangement, Moravia and Silesia fell into his power, although he never fulfilled the condition by which these lands were to be repurchased at the price of 400,000 ducats, so that the title of the Bohemian crown to these districts was disputed with some show of reason.

The reign of King Vladislav is one of the most unsatisfactory periods in the history of the Bohemian countries. The great economic and religious changes which, at the end of the fifteenth century, denoted the outset of a new era for Europe, found Bohemia and Moravia divided by class dissensions. The hereditary monarchy had been greatly

weakened as a result of events since the Hussite war, and the loss of the great crown demesnes of former times had deprived it of its power and influence. Economically as well as politically, the nobility were supreme in the country; they were, however, filled with a boundless ambition for power, and were ready to pass all limits in their efforts to weaken the monarchy, to oppose the privileges

and freedom of the towns, or to keep down the peasant class in a state of slavery and serfdom.

The highest positions in the country were exclusively in the hands of the nobles and knights; they enjoyed unlimited power in the provincial assemblies, and in 1500 compiled a legal code, the "Ordinances of Vladislav," which was to secure their predominance for ever. The king agreed to the limitations, great and small, which the nobility placed upon his power. The citizen class, however, was determined to oppose these encroachments upon the principles of justice with the more vigour as they found their material welfare greatly injured by the arbitrary rule of the nobles.



DRESS OF A LADY OF PRAGUE AND A MERCHANT'S WIFE IN THE MIDDLE OF SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The nobles infringed the town monopoly of brewing, forbade the towns to acquire landed property, limited the freedom of the fairs, and so forth. Consequently the towns continually complained to the king.

These complaints produced little effect, for the reason that, after his elevation to the throne of Hungary, Vladislav had

Nobles and People in Opposition removed his capital from Prague to Ofen, and remained absent from Bohemia for years at a time. There were, more-

over, uninterrupted hostilities between the citizens and nobles, who respectively formed federations for continuing their mutual strife. These conditions were in no way altered by the short stay which Vladislav made at Prague in 1502, as the king at once took the side of the nobles and decided the quarrel against the towns, while at a later period he withdrew his decision, though he could not induce the nobility to feel satisfied with his change of attitude. The outrages and aggressions committed by each side increased the bitterness of the struggle, and from year to year the tension grew more severe; but from 1502 to 1509 the king remained in Hungary, and left affairs to take their course in Bohemia and Moravia.

For the history of Silesia the reign of Vladislav was of importance, inasmuch as this prince, who was ever ready to bestow his favours, issued an important constitutional law to the Silesian orders on November 28th, 1498. This was substantially a confirmation of all previous concessions, with certain further additions. The president of the province, that is to say, the governor and highest official in Silesia, was always to be a Silesian prince; the estates also obtained a right of voting taxes, some relief from military service, and a high court of justice, known as the "Court of the Princes," which was composed of the territorial lords, and formed a final court of appeal for every class.

The King's Feeble Government This arrangement might have served as a starting point for the further development of the administration in Silesia. However, in this country also the king's feeble government, which was directed from Ofen, gave rise to disputes of every kind. The bishopric of Breslau had for several years been carrying on a quarrel, which lasted till 1504, with the town of Breslau and some Silesian princes, owing to the election of an unpopular coadjutor. Some

years previously—in 1497—the Duke Nicholas of Oppeln had ended his life on the scaffold in consequence of an act of aggression against the governor, Duke Casimir of Teschen. The town of Breslau was at feud, now with one and now with another of these princes, and marauding raids were of daily occurrence. The king's decree to secure peace and his threats of punishment proved as futile here as they did in the other provinces.

Vladislav enjoyed little personal influence unless when he came forward in person and secured services in return for new privileges. In 1509 he was anxious that his son Lewis, born in 1506, who was already king of Hungary, should be crowned king of Bohemia during his life; he was therefore obliged, after an absence of seven years, to decide upon a journey throughout his remaining territories in order to secure the completion of his project by his personal influence. He soon attained his main object. On February 17th, 1509, he made a state entry into Prague with his children and court; on March 11th, some delay having

Moravians Do Homage to King Lewis been caused by the illness of the young prince, the coronation of Lewis took place. Other difficulties, especially

the struggle between the nobles and the towns, were discussed in the course of a series of diets, but no result was secured.

In February, 1510, Vladislav left Bohemia and betook himself to Olmütz, where the Moravian orders did homage to Lewis, upon receipt of the customary privileges; thence the king went to Hungary, and in the winter of 1510 and 1511 again returned with the youthful monarch and the rest of his family to Silesia, where he also secured from the princes and estates the recognition of his son as his successor. The confusion of legal relations which prevailed under King Vladislav is shown by the fact that he received the homage of the Silesians, not as King of Bohemia, but as King of Hungary, though at the same time he had expressly emphasised the fact that Silesia and Moravia belonged to the Bohemian crown, in an imperial letter to the Bohemians during his stay at Prague on January 11th, 1510.

Hardly, however, had the king returned to Hungary when his attention was again occupied by the quarrel between the Orders of Bohemia and Moravia, which was all the more dangerous, as the towns appeared

to be obstinately resolute. They formed a federation, and on June 20th, 1513, concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with Duke Bartholomæus of Münsterberg, the grandson of King George Podiebrad, who was to represent their party at the court of King Vladislav. He proved successful in convincing the king and his advisers of the destructive influence upon Bohemia of the dominant party of nobles. Towards the end of the year 1513 Vladislav was persuaded to receive the demands of the towns with more favour than he had previously shown them.

However, his want of determination and his vacillation delayed a definite decision, although after the death of Bartholomæus the office of mediator between the nobles and towns was undertaken with considerable cleverness and success by his cousin Charles of Münsterberg. The struggle was raging with undiminished heat when Vladislav II. died on March 13th, 1516, only a few months after he had concluded the important marriage contract of July, 1515, with the Emperor Maximilian I., between his own children Lewis and Anna, and the grandchildren of the emperor, Ferdinand and Maria; this contract also included a federation in which room was found for King Sigismund of Poland.

King Lewis II. was no more than a child, though already crowned. Hence it was necessary to agree upon some form of regency for the moment. After long negotiation between the orders in Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, and also in Hungary, the task was entrusted to the German emperor and to the king of Poland. However, these guardians could exercise no immediate influence of any kind upon the provinces inherited by Lewis, and the power of the nobles continued to increase. In Bohemia and Moravia the quarrels between the estates continued as before. The nobles oppressed the towns, travelling merchants and citizens were attacked by

robber knights, and the towns made reprisals upon the nobles and their associates, often executing them without ceremony. Isolated peasant revolts in Bohemia are also reported by the chroniclers. The "Compact of St. Wenzel" of September

**The Great
Plague
of 1520-1**

28th, 1517, in which a partial agreement between the estates was secured by the Moravian baron, William of Pernstein, proves the pressing need of some compromise, however partial. An important point was the definition of the competency of the common law and of the town courts respectively. Disputes of an economic nature and the like were deferred for after consideration. Peace,

indeed, was not finally secured. The weakness of the royal power made a recurrence of the struggle inevitable after a few years. However, the public attention was occupied with other events, such as the plague, which began in Prague in 1520, and ravaged the whole country in 1521, the Lutheran movement, and the Turkish danger.

In the year 1522 King Lewis entered his Bohemian kingdom for the first time as an independent ruler, with the object of putting an end to the arbitrary government of the nobles, as continued to their own advantage for years by

the chief burgrave of Prague, Zdenek Lev of Rozmital. The real motive for this journey was the unavoidable necessity for seeking help against the Turks outside of Hungary itself. His route first led him to Brünn, where he received the homage of the Moravian orders, and confirmed their rights; he attempted to settle a number of class disputes, and then made his way to the Bohemian frontier, where he was met by the Bohemian ambassadors. After a short stay in some of the more important towns of Bohemia, he reached Prague on March 28th, 1522, and made a solemn entry with his young wife and his friend and tutor the Margrave George of Brandenburg. Difficulties at once arose. A series of troublesome negotiations



THE LAST INDEPENDENT KING
Lewis II., who was a mere child when he came to the throne, was the last independent king of Bohemia and Hungary, reigning from 1516 till 1526, when he met his death at the battle of Mohacs against the Turks.

began forthwith with the estates of the kingdom in reference to the appointment of a new chancellor of Bohemia, and the form of oath to observe the constitution which the king was to take. When the wording of this oath had been once passed, it was to remain in force in Bohemia for centuries. Slow progress also

King Lewis was made with other matters
Dismisses of business—the queen's
His Officials coronation, the payment of
the heavy debts incurred in

King Vladisav's time, and the equipment of an auxiliary army against the Turks. In the summer of 1522 violent disorder broke out in Silesia, especially in the town of Schweidnitz. Finally, at the end of the year, relations between King Lewis and the ruling nobles became so strained that, at the diet of February 5th, 1523, the king secured the dismissal of all the existing officials of the country, in particular of Lev of Rozmital, and introduced a constitutional change, chiefly intended to restore the royal power to its rightful position.

Notwithstanding numerous embassies and appeals, no help was to be gained from Hungary or from the king; to the internal troubles of that country the Turkish danger was now added. When the Sultan Suleiman I. started from Constantinople for Hungary with a vast army in April, 1526, the youthful monarch resolved to oppose him. His army, which included Bohemian, Moravian, and Silesian mercenaries, was overwhelmed by the superior numbers of the Turks; in the Battle of Mohacs, on August 29th, 1526, it was annihilated, and the king was unfortunately drowned in a swamp of the Danube while in flight. The death of the last of the Jagellons on the throne of Bohemia and Hungary, at the age of twenty and childless, forms an event of importance in the world's history, in so far as it occasioned the foundation of the

The Last Austrian monarchy under the
of the sceptre of the Hapsburgs.
Jagellons Bohemia, the centre of that
group of countries the historical
development of which has been briefly
detailed, may be regarded in 1526 as
a kingdom a thousand years old, if we
assume its history to begin with the
establishment of the Slavs in the
province after the Germanic emigra-
tion. It is an era rich in examples of
national rise and progress. From its own

resources, and building upon foundations hidden in the prehistoric period, Bohemia evolved a constitution which enabled the country to secure and to maintain a definite position among the bodies politic of Central Europe. It produced a royal house of indigenous growth, the Premyslids, whose pride and power raised their prestige to a level with that of any ruling dynasty in Central Europe. Its territorial power increased. It is true that the national dynasty was restricted within definite limits; calamitous failure was the result of the attempt of Ottokar II. to bring German provinces under his power.

The extinction of the native dynasty at the outset of the fourteenth century and the accession of foreigners to the Bohemian throne produced a complete change in the situation. No obstacle prevented a Bohemian king of German nationality from rising to the height of supremacy within the extensive German empire; but the people opposed the transformation of Bohemia into the most important of the German principalities at the expense of the Slav nationality. The national feeling

Foreigners of the Slavs rose in behalf of
on the Throne a reaction and speedily tri-
of Bohemia umphed. But the attempt
to construct a national prin-
cipality upon the basis of home material was
also a failure. As under the German kings,
so also under the Polish kings, Bohemia
found her destiny committed to the care
of rulers who pushed her into the back-
ground when the possibility of acquiring
the crown of Hungary became manifest.

Under such circumstances, and in view of the fact that the constitutional independence of the country and the maintenance of its throne were repeatedly endangered by the secession of the subject provinces, especially of Moravia, it was fortunate for the country that after Lewis's death the crown fell to the powerful Hapsburg dynasty. The result at which the Premyslid Ottokar II. had aimed upon occasion and with incomplete understanding, the result that the far-sighted diplomacy of Charles IV. had marked as the final object of Bohemian policy, the result that had been nominally, at least, attained under Ladislaus Posthumus—became an accomplished fact in the year 1526; the three states of Bohemia, Hungary and Austria were united as one powerful monarchy in South-east Europe.

BERTHOLD BRETHOLZ



THE ORIGIN OF THE EASTERN SLAVS

A PRELIMINARY CHAPTER TO THE HISTORY OF POLAND AND RUSSIA

IF what may be called the Slavonic line serves to mark a genuine division between Western and Eastern Europe, there is another division hardly less definite in Eastern Europe itself. Geographically, this is marked by an irregular line drawn from the Baltic to the western end of the Carpathian mountains, which themselves form the barrier till the Danube district is reached. In other words, the territories now called Poland and Russia are in some sense a region apart. Their peoples do not come into touch with the Teutonic west until the tenth century, though Eastern Byzantium becomes aware of them some hundred years earlier. Even at the outset these peoples emerge in definitely distinguished nationalities, Polish and Russian, though neither of them has at this stage absorbed the non-Slavonic population of the Baltic provinces. Kin as they are to the southern and western Slavs, of whom we have already treated, they nevertheless appear on the scene of history so far separated from these and so far associated with each other, that their origins require a single chapter to themselves, before we embark upon the separate histories of Poland and Russia.

Difference of the Eastern and Western Slavs to the southern and western Slavs, of whom we have already treated, they nevertheless appear on the scene of history so far separated from these and so far associated with each other, that their origins require a single chapter to themselves, before we embark upon the separate histories of Poland and Russia.

Slavonic legends tell of three brothers, Lech, Rus, and Cech, said to have been the founders of three great nations, the Russians, Lechs (Laches, Lechites = Poles), and Czechs (the Bohemian stock). In reality, however, the matter stood otherwise. The Slavonic tribes lived independently of each other. In the course of time one tribe, as happened in the case of the Romans, succeeded in extending its dominion over others, which then adopted its name. The tribe which gave its name to the others need not have been entirely Slavonic; thus the Bulgarians, although of Turkish stock, have become Slavoni-

cised, and have now given their name to the subjugated Slavs. The same thing may in the end have been the case with Rus, Lech, and Cech.

What, then, is the origin of the names? The point has been much discussed among Slavonic and German scholars. The "Russian Chronicle" relates that about the year 859 Varangians (Scandinavians) ruled the north Russian Slavs, but had been subsequently driven out. When quarrels broke out between the Russians, they sent an embassy over the sea to the Varangians, and asked them to rule over them once more. Three brothers, Rurik, Sineus and Truvor, of the Varagian tribe of the Ruotsi—that is, Swedes—came to the Slavs, and took up their abode in Old Ladoga, Isborsk, and Bjelosersk. From Rurik, the eldest, was descended the Russian princely house of the Rurikovitch, which is said to have ruled Russia until the end of the sixteenth century.

The same Chronicle also asserts that the whole of Novgorod was called Rosland, or Russia, from this family. This "Northman," or "Varagian," view has found ardent champions among modern writers. Considerably more than a hundred Scandinavian names are found in very early records; even the names of the rapids in the Dnieper, the old Varagian way to Byzantium, have been declared to be Scandinavian. The opinion is, however, hardly tenable in all its points.

The Germ of the Russian State Some intimate relations between the Novgorodians, who formed the germ of the Russian state, and the Scandinavians cannot be denied; but it is questionable whether also the name "Rus" is derived from them. The Slavonic tribes round Kiev and the south of Russia, where later the real centre of Russia lay, bore from time immemorial the name of "Russians."

Finally, and this would be the best argument against the theory, the kingdom, which admittedly must have existed there before the Northmen were summoned, must have also borne a name, and a kingdom, except through conquest, seldom changes its name. The south was known to the Arabs as "Russia," and the Black

Origin of the Name "Russia" Sea was simply termed the Russian Sea—as, for instance, in Nestor and Masudi—at a time when the Varagian princes were hardly yet familiar with the people of Kiev. We ought at all events not to forget that "Ros" may have been known in Byzantium as merchants even before 840, as is clear from a report of Bishop Prudentius of Troyes and from contemporary Arab accounts. The name probably had been transferred to the whole of Russia by Byzantines, who called the tribes in the south of Russia "Ros." Again, it is suggested that Hros is one of the names of the Herulians, who were once settled on the northern coast of the Black Sea; some of whom, after the defeat of 512 inflicted by the Lombards, went back to Sweden. Thus the otherwise astonishing familiarity of the northern Vikings with South Russia and the waterway of the Volga would be no longer surprising.

The meaning of the names "Pole" and "Lech" is equally obscure. While the name "Polani" may be Slavonic, the name "Lach," or "Lech," seems to be of foreign origin. Some persons have, as in the case of the name "Rus," looked for a Scandinavian etymology and understood northern conquerors by the Lechs. But in this connection they have overlooked the fact that Great Poland, the real mother country, has never been called "Lachia," or "Lechia," but only the Cracow district, and from it North Poland. The name "Lach," "Lech," "Lechi" seems to mean simply "foreigner," and is connected with the names "Walch," "Wlach,"

Poland and the Poles "Walach," "Wälsch," applied by Slavs not only to Italians and Roumanians, but to the semi-Slavonic Bulgarians and the Croats, as well as to the "Little" Poles. On the other hand, Posen and Gnesen, the Polish mother-country, was always called Polonia, which title was then extended to South Poland—that is to say, the subsequently conquered Cracow. Since this name was used officially, it superseded all others, and throughout Europe

the kingdom was finally called Poland. Other peoples—Lithuanians, Finns, Bulgarians, Khayars—to be presently described, have exercised temporary supremacy within what we now call Russian territory. But the Slavonic tribes, who occupied chiefly the centre of the East European plain, found themselves in the majority and unceasingly drove before them the heterogeneous nations, first by peaceful colonisation, and then by the sword. We may assume that all Slavs as a whole had the same customs, the same religion, the same tribal and national institutions. Differences will be apparent only where Nature prescribed other conditions of life or where foreign influence made itself felt.

Thus, the Slavs on the sea-coast lived in one way, those on the steppes or in the forests in another. Although they originally appeared in Europe as a united nation with similar customs, ideas, language, traditions, and government, yet the different natural surroundings soon impressed a distinctive stamp on the principal tribes and guided social, religious, and legal life into different paths. The nomads of the steppes can hardly have held the same faith as the dwellers on the sea-coast. Again, while the forest-dwellers paid their tribute in furs and honey, the tribes of the lowlands discharged it in horses or cattle. If the large clan community was the natural form of life among the dwellers on the fertile plains with their agriculture, in the forests the families were forced to separate one from another.

Further differences were produced by the influence of neighbours; thus the northern Slavs, who lived near the Teutons, had a kindred religion and mythology. The change of language was closely connected with this, since to express new ideas, new words had to be invented or borrowed from other tribes.

An attempt has been made to draw a general picture of the life of all the Slavonic tribes, but in doing so the fact has been overlooked that such a picture can be true only of a time when the Slavs still formed a single united people—the time, that is, before the Christian era. Our authorities, however, dating from an era five hundred, or possibly a thousand years later, are extremely defective, and it is not surprising that the results of such



THE SCANDINAVIAN HERO, RURIK, THE FIRST OF THE RUSSIANS

A daring sea-rover, Rurik the Rodsen or Oarsman, landed, in 862, on the Russian shore of the Baltic, and, with his brothers, Sineus and Truvor, subjugated the country from Novgorod to the Volga. From Rurik, who died in 879, came the princely house of the Rurikovitch, which is said to have ruled Russia until the end of the sixteenth century.

imperfect investigations are conflicting. It is asserted that all Slavs were agriculturists at the period when they came into the light of history. Can that assertion hold good of the forest-dwellers or the inhabitants of the lakes and swamps? Our authorities do not in any way corroborate it. A writer of the twelfth century relates in astonishment that he heard of a man in the Arctic regions who had lived all his life on fish. That would hardly be an isolated case. Forests, rivers, and swamps then covered at least a tenth of the surface. If the Slavs during their migrations kept to the river valleys we can hardly call this a peculiar characteristic of the race.

The Slavonic pagan religion, about which we know very little, resembles in its main ideas that of India and of other Aryans. The Slavs had the dualism between good and evil deities; they had also their family gods, like the Greeks and Romans. They, too, regarded Nature as animated by various beings, and animals were held sacred by them, as in Greece and other places. It was merely their

Family Life natural environment which taught men in the northern
Among the Slavs forests to revere the owl, the wolf (as were-wolf), and, on the plains, the horse. The Slavs, too, honoured the sun, moon, and stars, thunder and lightning; they were also fire-worshippers. But inquiry has not told us in what the true Slavonic element—that is, the innovation—really consists.

The same holds good of the legal and social conditions of the Slavs. The family was the foundation of their national and religious life. The eldest of the family was the supreme lawgiver, judge, and priest. Since the knowledge of the laws, customs, and ritual could be transmitted only orally, this naturally fluctuating tradition was all important. The Slavs, divided into separate independent tribes, could not but diverge more widely from each other in their methods of life. The separate districts were called Zupas, Opole, or Wolost.

We cannot decide whether the Zupa is genuinely Slavonic or is to be compared with, for example, the old Germanic Goba. The centre of a district was the Grad (*gorod* = borough), where the tribal sanctuary stood. The ancient places, where once a *gorod* stood, were called *gorodysce*. But it cannot be settled whether *gorod*

is peculiar to the Slavs only, or whether it is identical with the old Gothic words *garde* (watch) and *garder* (to watch). Everywhere in Slavonic countries a definite district was surrounded with a boundary fence, while the roads were watched and defended with palisades, which were called *preseka*; at suitable points guards were

The Traders of the Plains and Rivers posted on watch-towers, called *straza*. Before the ninth century a brisk trade passed through Russia from the Gulf of Finland past the Lake of Ilmen to the Dwina, and then down the Dnieper over the Black Sea into Greece. The oldest wooden towns, originally trading stations, lay on this celebrated route from the Varagian country to Byzantium. A frequented trade route from the Black Sea to the Baltic led up the Dniester to the river San, then down that river and the Vistula. While the first became the main trade route of Russia, the other became the chief highroad to Poland; both, perhaps, date from Phœnician times. The vessels and their cargoes were hauled up from one river system to the other; for example, from the Dniester to the San; hence the name *wolok*, *wolocyska* (haulages). The trading stations grew into towns, since the country people flocked into them for greater security. The public affairs of the town and the surrounding district were organised in these markets at assemblies which were called *wece*. The meeting was summoned by the circulation of a token, or, as later, by the tolling of a bell.

Differences in the administration of law and justice must have been noticeable in the various districts, while the conditions in the same tribe would naturally alter during the course of centuries. Persons who speak in general terms about the Slavonic laws and customs of that age are only deluding themselves, as much as if they spoke of contemporary

Slavonic Customs Not Universal universal Germanic customs. Distinctions must inevitably have prevailed. The truth is that hitherto it has been

impossible to pronounce any deliberate opinion about the religion, mythology, laws, family life, or civilisation of the ancient pagan Slavs. It is on this most slippery soil of national peculiarities, where the inquirer oscillates between self-glorification and unwarranted depreciation of his neighbour, that a fabric has been built

THE ORIGIN OF THE EASTERN SLAVS

up, out of most untenable assertions. The occasional accounts given by old writers are noteworthy, especially since Slavonic paganism lingered on for centuries after the Christian era. Jordanes, in 550 A.D., says of the Slavs "morasses and forests are their towns"; Procopius tells us that they lived in dirty, scattered

The Defensive Devices of the Slavs

huts, and easily shifted their abode. The Emperor Maurice relates, in the year 600, that they lived in forests, near rivers, marshes, and lakes, which were difficult to approach. They made many exits from their houses, in order to escape any possible dangers. They buried all their property in the ground, and in order to frustrate any hostile attacks nothing but bare necessities were left visible. Helmold of Bosau, in 1170, gives a similar account at the end of his Chronicle of the Slavs: "They take little trouble about building their houses; they quickly plait twigs together into huts which supply a bare shelter against storm and rain. So soon as the call to arms is heard, they collect their stores of corn, bury them together with their gold, silver, and other valuables, and conduct their wives and children into the fortresses or the forests. Nothing is left for the enemy but the hut, whose loss is easily repaired."

"When they go into battle," says Procopius, "they attack the enemy on foot, holding shield and spear in their hands. They do not wear armour; they have neither cloaks nor shirts, but advance to the fight clad only in trousers." The wives, as among the Teutons, occupied an honourable position; they held property of their own, although, as in other countries, polygamy prevailed and wives were carried off by force. The Russian Chronicle relates of the Drewljans that they lived like cattle, knew nothing of marriage, but carried off the maidens on the rivers. It is recorded of certain tribes that no

Primitive Marriage Customs

marriages took place but games in the middle of the village. The people assembled for the games, danced, and indulged in every sort of debauchery, and each man carried off the woman to whom he was betrothed. This was the case among other peoples also. Bretislav I. Achilles, so Cosmas of Prague records, in 1125, carried off his bride Judith from Schweinfurt. Until quite recently the *otmiza*, or capture of wives, was customary among

the Serbs. Many instances of the gentle disposition of the Slavs are mentioned by the old chroniclers. Procopius says: "covetousness and deceit are unknown among them." Maurice extols their hospitality. Helmold records of the Ranes (Ruanians, or Rügen): "Although they are more hostile to Christians and also more superstitious than the other Slavs, they possess many good qualities. They are extremely hospitable and show great respect to their parents. Neither beggars nor paupers are found among them. A man who is feeble through sickness or advanced age is entrusted to the care of his heir. The virtues most highly esteemed among the Slavs are hospitality and filial regard." The man who refused hospitality had his house burned down. It was permissible to steal in order to provide food for a traveller.

Theophylactus Simocattes, in the first half of the seventh century, relates the following anecdote: As the emperor Maurice was on his way to Thrace to prepare for war against the Avars, the escort of the emperor seized three men who carried zithers. When asked to what race they belonged, they replied that they were Slavs and lived on the western ocean; the Khagan had sent envoys to the princes of their country, with many presents, to solicit help. When they heard that the Romans had reached the highest stage of power and culture, they escaped and reached Thrace. They carried zithers because they were unfamiliar with arms, since no iron was found in their country. The Arabs also testify that music was practised by the Slavs.

A noteworthy account of the funeral customs of a Slavonic tribe is furnished by the ambassador of the Caliph al-Muqtadir, Ahman ibn Fadlan. When a poor man died, they built a small boat for him, placed him in it, and burnt it. This was customary among the North Germanic tribes. On the death of a rich man they collected his possessions and divided them into three parts. The one part was reserved for his family; with the second they prepared an outfit for him, and with the remaining part they bought intoxicating drinks to be drunk on the day when the slave-girl consents to be a victim and is burnt with her master. "When, indeed, a chief dies, the family ask his bondmen and bondwomen: 'Which of you is willing

to die with him?' Then one of them answers: 'I will.' Whoever has uttered this word is bound. But mostly it is a slave-girl. . . . Boat, wood, and girl together with the dead man were soon reduced to ashes. They then raised above the place where the boat, which had been dragged up out of the river, had stood,

**The Strange
Ritual of a
Slav Funeral**

a sort of round hillock, erected in the middle of it a large beech-trunk, and wrote on it the name of the dead man with the name of the king of the Ros." If we compare this with the account given by Herodotus of the burial of a Scythian king we shall find, in spite of many differences in detail, the same fundamental idea.

These are our materials for estimating the degree of culture which the Slavs of that age had attained. There was not wanting among them a belief in the life after death. They are said to have been acquainted with writing; and in connection with this statement the so-called Runic characters must be taken into account. Traces of music and architecture can be found among them, though in a crude form, and they were lovers of poetry and song. It can hardly be supposed that, as many Slavonic scholars assert, they possessed some astronomical knowledge, and had a civil year with twelve months. The names of the months which are found later among various Slavonic tribes were indubitably first formed by learned priests, on the model of the Greek and Roman names, at that point in the Christian era when the Julian calendar with twelve instead of ten months was coming into general use in Europe. Charles the Great first proposed among the Franks the substituting of German names for the Latin names of the months.

The independent spirit of the Slavs is specially mentioned by German as well as Byzantine writers. Widukind, the

**The Slavs'
Love of
Freedom**

historian of the first two Saxon emperors, says of them: "The Slavs are a dogged, laborious race, inured to the scantiest food, and they regard as a pleasure what is often a heavy burden to men of our time. They face any privations for their beloved liberty, and in spite of many reverses they are always ready to fight again. The Saxons fight for glory and the expansion of their frontiers, the Slavs for their freedom." Adam of Bremen records a

century later: "I have heard the most truth-loving King Sven of Denmark say repeatedly that the Slavonic peoples could long ago have been converted to Christianity if the greed of the Saxons had not interposed obstacles. These think more of exacting tribute than of converting pagans."


There is a particular appropriateness in the words which the Polish historian, John Dlugosz, wrote about the Poles about 1480, although he is describing his contemporaries: "The Polish nobles thirst for glory and are bent on booty; they despise dangers and death . . . they are devoted to agriculture and cattle-breeding; they are courteous and kind towards strangers and guests, and more hospitable than any other people. The peasants shrink from no work or trouble, endure cold and hunger, and are superstitious . . . they care little about the maintenance of their houses, being content with few ornaments; they are spirited and brave to rashness, . . . of high stature, of strong and well proportioned build, with a sometimes fair, sometimes dark complexion." The well-known

**Physique
of
the Poles**

peaceful disposition of many Slavonic tribes, and, above all, the circumstance that they adhered to the old tribal constitution, which prevented any creation of a state on a large scale, were the causes why the Slavs in their pagan period played no important part, but were first aroused to a new life by their contact with the civilised nations. Christian Rome and Byzantium saw the development of Slavonic kingdoms in the north, after they had to some degree furnished the political germs for that growth.

We may now turn to those non-Slavonic peoples already referred to: in the north, close to the Baltic Sea, the Lithuanians, and further to the north-east, the Finns; on the Volga the Bulgarians; and in the south the Khazars. Of the above mentioned the Lithuanians and the Finns alone have in some degree preserved their individuality.

History finds the Lithuanian tribes settled on the shore of the Baltic between the Vistula and Dwina, and southwards as far as the middle stream of the Bug. In one place only their frontier touches the Finnish Livonians, otherwise they are wedged between Slavonic peoples. They divided into the following tribes in the



A CHARACTERISTIC GROUP OF LITHUANIAN PEASANTS



TYPICAL WOODLAND SCENE WITH GIRLS IN ORDINARY AND GALA DRESS

LITHUANIANS · A SURVIVING RACE OF THE BALTIC REGION

tenth century. The Wends were settled at the mouth of the Dwina, the Letts on the right bank of the Dwina, bordering on the Livonians; on the left bank of the Dwina were the tribes of the Semgala and the Zelones; the Kurland peninsula was occupied by the Korses or Kurones. The Smudinians and the Lithuanians dwelt

The Whole Named After the Part

on the Niemen; west of these were settled the eleven Prussian tribes; in the south-west the Yatvings. Since the duty of the Smudinians and Lithuanians who dwelt in the centre of the whole system was to fight for the national freedom, and first of all to found a larger kingdom, Lithuania, all these tribes were finally called Lithuanians. Here, again, was an instance of the name of a part being transferred to the whole.

These tribes, however, formed one nation only in the ethnographical sense; in other respects they lived as separate clans. As early as the thirteenth century Lithuanian leaders, or tribal elders, are mentioned; they exercised authority only over small districts, and were styled "Rikys" by the Prussians, and "Kunigas" by the Lithuanians. It was not until the danger of foreign subjugation threatened them all that they united more or less voluntarily into one state.

The Lithuanians were the last of all the Europeans to adopt Christianity; temporarily converted in 1387, they relapsed, and were again converted in the fifteenth century. Owing to this we have full accounts of their pagan customs. We find among them three chief dieties, similar to the Indian Trimurti and the later Greek Tritheism. The place of Zeus was taken in their creed by Perkunas (thunder), represented as a strong man holding a stone hammer or arrow in his hand; Atrimpos, who was conceived in the shape of a sea-serpent twined into a circle, corresponded to Poseidon, while

Pagan Beliefs of Lithuanians

Poklav, a grey-bearded, pale-faced old man, with his head swathed in linen, was regarded as the god of the Lower World. Besides these, the sun, moon, stars, animals, birds, snakes, and even frogs were worshipped. The sun-god had various names, for example, Sotwaros; the moon goddess was called Lajama; the rain-deity, Letuwanis. The whole realm of Nature was animated by good and evil divine beings, on which the life of man was

dependent at every turn and step. Among such we find the deities Lel and Lado, who were also known to the Slavs; Ragutis, the deity of joy and marriage; Letuwa, the deity of happiness; also Andaj, Diweriks, Mjedjej, Nadjej, and Telawelda. Besides the sun, fire was held in great veneration. The eternal fire of znicz, which was under the protection of the goddess Praurima, burnt in the temple of Perkunas in front of his image. There were sacred lakes and groves, as among the Greeks and the Romans.

The affinity of the Lithuanian with the Slavonic and Germanic religion proves that these nations formerly lived together. But when we discover that the Lithuanians, like the Teutons, worshipped the god of thunder, whose sacred tree was the oak, and whose temples stood in oak groves, we realise how hard it is to single out the genuinely Lithuanian element. The chief shrine of Perkunas was situated somewhere near Romowo, in Prussia; but when Prussia was conquered by the Poles it was removed into the interior, to the confluence of the Dubissa and Niemen,

Power of the Pagan Priests

and further east to the Wilija, in the direction of Kernowo, and lastly to Wilna. The sacerdotal system was highly developed. The high priest, who had his seat at the chief sanctuary, was called Krywe-Krywejto. Subordinate to him were all the priests, male and female (Wajdelotes), whose principal occupation was to offer sacrifices. A higher grade among them was formed by the Krewy, to whom were entrusted the superintendence and care of the temple; their badge was a stick of peculiar shape. A life of chastity was obligatory to them. The power of the head priest, Krywe-Krywejto extended over every tribe. High and low bowed before his sign, which he sent by his Wajdelotes. One-third part of the booty taken in war belonged to him.

Ample sacrifices were made to the Lithuanian gods, mostly animals, occasionally prisoners of war. They were always burnt-offerings. The old Krywe-Krywejto himself, like other old men also, is said not infrequently to have mounted the pyre—so strong was the prevailing belief in the purifying power of fire. The priests also, in default of every sort of political government, disseminated public order and civilisation, the Krywe-Krywejto being as it were, the head chieftain of all the tribe.



FINNISH MILK-SELLERS IN A CHARACTERISTIC WINTER SCENE



TYPICAL FINNISH MAIDENS



CHILDREN'S FAVOURITE PASTIME

FAMILIAR SCENES AMONG THE FINNISH PEOPLE

A proof that the same system obtained among the Slavs and Teutons is afforded by the word *kunigas* (*kuning* = king), which among the Slavs denotes both prince and priest; *knjaz* (prince), *knez* (czechish = priest), or in Polish *ksiadz* (priest), and *ksiaze* (prince). The priests were in possession of a method of writing. The chronicler

**Writing
of the Northern
Peoples**

of the Teutonic Order, Peter of Dusburg (c. 1326), asserts that writing was unknown to the Lithuanians; but this can be true only of the common people. Traces of a secret writing have been found. The Runic characters were probably familiar to all the northern peoples—Slavs, Teutons, Lithuanians, and Finns.

If Lithuania had not encountered any obstacles in its expansion, a theocratic monarchy would probably have been formed there. External dangers led to the severance of the spiritual from the military power, and thus to the development of a secular government. The legend was current among the people that Widemut—perhaps connected with the lawgiver Odin, common to all Germanic tribes—had laid the foundation of a social and political organisation. Family life was dependent on the priests, who administered justice according to ancient custom. Peter of Dusburg relates that the Lithuanians held meetings in sacred places. They occupied their time in agriculture and cattle breeding, drank mare's milk, and were skilled in brewing beer and mead. Rich men drank from horns, poor men from wooden cups. Autumn was a season of mirth in the villages. Guests were treated with especial attention, hospitably entertained, and not dismissed until they were drunk.

The Lithuanians learnt the art of war by necessity. They fought with bow and arrow, sword and lance, and also with battle-axe and sling. The oldest weapon was an oaken club. The gods

**The Art
of War in
Lithuania**

were consulted before every campaign. Clad in the skins of aurochs and bears, with caps on their heads, they marched to battle amid the flare of trumpets, sometimes on foot, sometimes mounted. On their military standards were depicted figures of deities, and men with bears' heads, or two wreaths, blue and yellow; the galloping horseman, who first appears in the coat of arms of Lithuania proper, was ultimately adopted by the whole race.

They contrived to cross the rivers in boats made of the hides of aurochs, or by holding on to the tails of their horses, as we are told the Hungarians and Tartars did. The home-coming warriors, if victors, were received by the women and girls with dance and song, but were treated with contempt after a defeat, while fugitives were punished by death. The Lithuanians also believed in a life after death. They equipped the dead man with all that he had required on earth—weapons, ornaments, and clothes, horses, hawks, slaves, and wives. They were then all burnt, and their ashes laid in the grave. A funeral feast was held in commemoration.

The Finns of the Ugrian-Mongol stock occupied originally the entire north of modern Russia. Their various tribes were settled as easterly neighbours of the Lithuanians between the White Sea, the Ural, and the Volga. The river Dwina can be roughly regarded as the boundary between Lithuanians and Finns, although some Lithuanians were to be found on the right bank of the Dwina. On the shores

**Livonians
and
Esthonians**

of the Baltic were settled the Livonians and the Esthonians, who still survive in Livonia and Esthonia. Besides these chief tribes, Wesses or Besses, Meren, Muro-mians, Tcheremisses, Jamen, Mordwinen, Tchuden, Permians, and others are mentioned in the Russian chronicles; they were settled more to the south, and were called Tchuden by the Slavs. Here once lay the Finnish kingdom of Biarmia, probably the modern Perm.

We possess very scanty information, derived from the Scandinavian Vikings who made their way there, about this kingdom so famous in northern legends. At the time of Alfred the Great, Otter was the first to come into these regions; then Wulstan. In the days of St. Olaf (1026) the Vikings Karli and Torer Hund followed. They professed to be merchants, brought furs, and then apparently withdrew, in order to lull the suspicions of the inhabitants. In reality, however, they were preparing for a raid, which Torer conducted, as an expert in Finnish magic. Their goal was the tombs of the Biarmians and the temple of their chief god Jumala. Marking their path by stripping the bark from the trees, they reached the meadow where the temple stood, surrounded by a high wooden



AN ESTHONIAN PEASANT GIRL IN HER NATIVE WOODLAND



PEASANT CHILDREN



WOMEN OF THE FARMING CLASS

ESTHONIANS: AN ANCIENT PEOPLE OF THE BALTIC SEA COAST

Paling; the guardians had gone away. The Vikings dug up the sepulchral mounds and found a quantity of gold. There stood in the temple an image of Jumala, on whose knees was placed a plate filled with gold; this Torer carried off. Karli, however, struck off the head of the idol, in order to seize its golden necklace. The guards rushed

Finns Recede Before the Slavs up at the noise, blew their horns, and the Vikings escaped their pursuers with difficulty.

This is almost the only account we have of Finnish Biarmia. Its history is then merged in that of Novgorod.

The Finnish tribes could not resist the advance of the Slavs. The Esthonians alone were able to maintain their nationality. Mordvinnic princes are mentioned by the Russian chroniclers even in the fourteenth century. The Finns, especially the Permians, carried on a modest trade; they were glad to take sabres from Mohammedan countries in exchange for furs. They also engaged in agriculture. Their religion resembled the Lithuanian. The Finns also were widely famed as soothsayers and magicians. This ice-bound country was otherwise little known or explored. Kaswini, who died in 1283, relates how the Bulgarians on the Kama and Volga traded with the Finns in dumb show. The Bulgarian brought his goods, pointed to them, and left them on the ground. He then came back, and found on the same spot such commodities as were used in the country. If he was satisfied with them he exchanged his goods for those deposited by the strangers; if he was dissatisfied, he took his own wares away again.

We have almost as little information about the Bulgarians, that nation of horsemen on the Volga, and even that only after the tenth century, when their prince Almys went over to Islam shortly before 921. We are indebted to this circumstance for the before-mentioned report of Ahmad

How They Dealt With "Witches" ben Fadlan (ibn Fadhlān, or Foszlan), who entered the capital, Bulgar, on May 11th, 922, as the envoy of

the Caliph. The Spanish Abu Hamid, who visited Great Bulgaria in the twelfth century, reports: "Every twenty years the old women of this country are suspected of witchcraft, and great excitement prevails among the people. The old women are then collected, their feet and hands are bound, and they are thrown into a

great river that flows past. Those who swim are considered to be witches, and are burnt; those who sink are regarded as innocent, and are rescued." Human sacrifices were not infrequent in those days. We come upon instances among the Herulians (Procopius and Ennodius) and the Ros (ibn Rusta), among the Wends or Sorbs (Bonifatius) and the pagan Poles (Thietmar), the Radimici, Wjatici, and Sewerane (Nestor), and even among the eastern Slavs. Most of the instances described were cases of the burning of widows. Some Slavonic tribes paid the Bulgarians a tribute in horses, furs, and other articles, such as an ox-hide, from every house.

At this same era the West Turkish nation of the Khazars, of whom we have evidence after the second century A.D., was settled in the south of Russia between the Caspian and Black Seas. The most flourishing period of the Khazar Empire seems to have been in the seventh century, after the fall of the Hun Empire. Their most important towns were: Saryg-sar, on the west bank of the Volga (yellow town; later Itil, now Astrachan), and

When the Khazars Flourished Khamlikh, or Khazaran, which lay opposite; also Samandar, or Smendr (now Tarchu, east of Temirchan-Schura, on the west shore of the Caspian Sea), and the fortress of Sarkel at the mouth of the Danube, built under the Emperor Theophilus in 833-835 by the Greek Petronas (in Nestor: Belaweza; destroyed by Sviatoslav); a second Khazar fortress of some temporary importance was Balangar, in the Caucasus.

The Khazars carried on an extensive trade with Bulgaria, Russia, Persia, and Byzantium. The half-nomadic population still lived partly in those Wojlok-Jurtes which we find at the present day among the Kirghiz. Only the richer men built themselves mud huts, and the Khagan alone had high tiled houses. The Khagan was the supreme head in religion, while a Veg stood at the head of military affairs. Under the Khagan Bulan—traditionally about 740; more correctly shortly after 860—the Khazars, after a temporary conversion to Christianity, partly adopted the Jewish faith. They were completely subjugated by Russia about 969. Remnants of the Khazars long remained in the Crimea and the Caucasus; some memories of them still survive in the names of a few towns.

VLADIMIR MILKOWICZ



BEFORE THE FRENCH REVOLUTION THE OLD POLISH EMPIRE AND THE MEN WHO SHAPED ITS DESTINIES

THE waves of Slavonic migration, which surged to and fro in the Far East of Europe, had from an early date come into contact with the peoples of Western Europe; but there were as yet only tribes and no large empire. The tidings first came to Constantinople in the ninth century that a large Russian Empire existed in the north. A hundred years later a powerful Polish Empire was discovered in the north-west. The credit of this discovery belongs to Germany. War had been raging between the two races since the middle of the eighth century, on the line of the Elbe, at the point where the Slavonic and German tribes came into contact with each other. But while the Germans won political unity through Charles the Great, assimilated Roman culture and adopted Christianity, the Slavs were still disunited, and were inimical to Western views on politics, religion, and culture. A bitter contest was waged for these principles, and finally for freedom. In the course of a hundred years the Slavs between the Elbe and the Oder were subjugated; the Slavs on the Oder also were now engaged

**Poland in
Contact with
the West**

in a desperate struggle, more especially since they were torn by internal feuds. It then happened that the Wends chose the Saxon Count Wichmann, who died in 967, and who had quarrelled with the German Empire, as their leader against the neighbouring Lisikaviki. Wichmann inflicted, in 962, two defeats on Misako—Miseko, or Mesko, a diminutive of Mstislav—and killed his brother; Mesko, in consequence, submitted to the Margrave Gero,

who was then stationed with an army on the Polish frontier, and agreed to pay a tribute for the country between the Oder and the Warthe. That was the first contact of Poland with the West.

In 965 the Spanish Jew Ibrahim ibn-Jacob travelled through Germany for trading purposes and made his way to

**An Observant
Trader
1,000 Years Ago**

Merseburg and Prague, where he became acquainted with the Slavs. "There are now," he wrote, "four princes among them," of whom he names "Mshka," i.e., Mesko, as "Prince of the North." "As regards the country of Mshka, it is the largest of the Slavonic countries. It is rich in corn, flesh, honey, and pasturage. The taxes, which he levies, are paid in Byzantine *Mitkal*; they serve to maintain his people. . . . He has 3,000 *Dsra* (*Duzina*, or bodyguard suite) . . . ; he gives them armour and horses, arms, and whatever they need. The Russians live to the East of Mshka and the Prussians in the north."

The above-named Misako, or Mesko, is, therefore, the first Polish prince who is authenticated by history. The later tradition relates that he was descended from the family of the Piast of Krushwitz; it speaks of a dynasty of the Piasts, and can give some account of his ancestors. *Piast* in Polish means much the same as tutor or guardian. In connection with the legendary narrative it is conjectured that a court official of the royal family, who filled the post of teacher to the children, resembling, therefore, a Frankish majordomo, overthrew the old dynasty

and obtained the throne. The Piast family ruled in Poland until 1370.

Poland comes into history at the time when Germany revived the claim of the Roman Empire to rule over all lands and peoples, and showed the strength necessary to enforce the claim. The Slavonic tribes, which adjoined on the east, although they obstinately defended their liberty, must have heard of these alleged claims of sovereignty, since they soon reconciled themselves to the position of vassals of the Holy Roman Empire. This empire, like the whole West, was dominated then by the Christian idea. To disseminate it was the noblest task, and the Church, which put forward legal claims, supplied the power and authority for it. The heathen Slavs in the East thus offered a wide field to German missionary enterprise; and with this purpose an archbishopric was founded in Magdeburg. The conversion of Poland to Christianity was, under these conditions, only a question of time.

Some years after the first contact with Germany Mesko married the daughter of the Bohemian prince Boleslav I., by name Dubrava. At her persuasion he and all his nobles are said to have accepted Christianity in 966. The political consideration that this was the only way to assert, even partially, his independence, must have turned the scale. He must have seen that Rome was the powerful head of the Christian world, and that upon Rome even Germany was, in a sense, dependent. In 968 a bishopric for the Polish territory was founded in Posen, under the jurisdiction of the archbishopric of Magdeburg. Jordan was the first Bishop of Posen.

This was the turning-point in the history of the Polish tribes; they began a new chapter of life with their connection with the West. Poland first grew into a powerful empire under the guidance of the Christian Church. For this reason Mesko must be regarded as the real founder of Poland.

He cemented more closely his amicable relations with the German Empire by wedding Oda, the daughter of the Margrave Thiedrich, after the death of his Bohemian consort in 977. He took part, however, in the conspiracy of Henry of Bavaria against the Emperor Otto II., in the year 976, and had to be reminded of his duties as a vassal in 979; nevertheless,

on the death of Otto II., in 983, the Poles once more sided with the rebellious Henry. It was only in 985 that Mesko loyally shared the campaigns of Germany against the Wends, and actually fought, in 990, against Boleslav of Bohemia, the brother of his deceased wife.

Mesko died in 992, and left several children by both wives, who, according to Slavonic law, were all entitled to inherit. Possibly he had contemplated some division of his inheritance. But the sovereignty over the whole empire was seized by Boleslav I., the son of the Bohemian mother; later called "Chabri" the Valiant. A man of unusual ability, he anticipated in some degree the results that coming centuries were destined to effect, and to some extent himself attained the objects for which the nation subsequently struggled. Cunning and brave, an admirable politician and administrator, possessed of indefatigable energy, he was superior to all who had dealings with him. A true appreciation of existing needs and the forces actually available prevented him from ever attempting the impossible. The nation did not prosper when it went outside the circle which he drew round it. At the very beginning of his reign he marched northwards and conquered Pomerania and the Prussian territory, and in the south Chrobatia with Cracow, and Moravia with Slovakia, as far as the Danube.

Just at this time Bishop Adalbert, who had been banished from Prague, went northwards to preach the Gospel to the pagan Prussians, and died a martyr's death there in 997. Boleslav ransomed his bones from the pagans and buried them in Gnesen. He knew that the bones of a saint were necessary for the founding of churches, and that high respect was then paid to relics. Adalbert thus became the patron of the Polish realm. Churches were built in his honour. The standard of the corps which the prince himself commanded bore as a badge the figure of Adalbert, and the military standard of the whole Polish army displayed his portrait. Boleslav must have already been negotiating with the emperor and the Pope on the subject of new bishoprics, for we find by the year 999 an organised body of clergy in Poland. Gaudentius, brother of Adalbert, was nominated to be Archbishop of Gnesen, distinct from

THE OLD POLISH EMPIRE

Magdeburg; he was given as suffragans the Bishop of Cracow for Chrobatia, the Bishop of Breslau for Silesia, and the Bishop of Kolberg for Pomerania. Posen still remained under Mainz.

Thus an independent church of Poland was established as a foundation for the later political independence. In the year 1000, when, according to the teaching of the Chiliasts the end of the world ought to have come, the fanatical Emperor Otto III. went to Gnesen, in order to pray at the tomb of the saint, to whom he was also related. He had a brilliant reception; but the political advantages which the Pole was able to obtain were not small. Otto approved of the ecclesiastical system of Poland, and promoted the prince, whom hitherto he had reckoned as the vassal of the German Empire, to be brother, friend, and ally under the title of Patricius. In his pursuit of the dream of a world-empire, Otto III. had lost his footing on the soil of fact. "May Heaven forgive the emperor," exclaimed Bishop Thietmar of Merseburg about 1018 discontentedly, "for

Church Unity Strengthens the Polish Empire having made a sovereign out of the Duke of Poland, who hitherto was a tributary, and for having exalted him so high that he soon sought to bring beneath his rule and degrade to servitude those who were once his superiors." It was shown afterwards that, in the days of the civil wars and disintegration, the solidarity of the Polish Empire was safeguarded and strengthened only by the unity of the Church.

The growth of the power of Poland caused alarm in Germany. Matters culminated in a war under Otto's successor, the Emperor Henry II., since Boleslav at the beginning of 1003 had annexed Bohemia also. Henry II. for many years waged war with great energy against the Duke of Poland, supported by Bohemia, which had been evacuated by Boleslav in 1004, and by the heathen Liutizes—an alliance which horrified the pious German clergy—but could effect nothing. Boleslav had his supporters everywhere, and roused up enemies on all sides for the emperor, even in Germany. The political and military superiority of Boleslav now showed itself in the clearest colours.

In the year 1005, Henry was forced to conclude a disadvantageous peace at Bautzen, while the treaty of Magdeburg,

in 1013, ratified the Pole's claim to all the conquests made in the East at the cost of Germany. Boleslav, indeed, in return did homage to the emperor at Merseburg, because he wished at the same time to turn against Russia. Being now recognised as an ally, he was accompanied on his Russian campaign by 300 German warriors, but obtained little success. In 1015 the war with Germany began afresh; it was not until 1018 that a second peace was concluded at Bautzen. The Elbe once more was the western frontier of Poland. Boleslav took Kiev on August 14th, 1018, and reinstated his exiled son-in-law Svia-topolk.

Although the union of Bohemia and Poland had not been successfully carried out, Boleslav had united most of the west Slavs, who were still independent of Germany, under his own sceptre, and had founded an empire which stretched from the Elster and the Elbe to the Dniester. He also emphasised the Slavonic as opposed to the Germanic features of national life. His name has thus become the banner of Polish patriotism. After so many successes the Polish duke solicited the title of king, and with this object sent an embassy to Rome. This was intercepted by the emperor, but after the death of Henry, in 1024, Boleslav placed the crown on his own head. He died in the year 1025 at the age of fifty-eight.

Under the first successors of the greatest Polish king the situation was at once changed; not one of the conquests of Boleslav could be retained. In the first place, the empire, according to custom, had to be divided between the heirs; but Boleslav I. had already decided that one of his sons should rule over the whole realm, and the other petty princes should be subordinate to him. Mesko II. did, in fact, assume the government with the crown, while we find his brothers and kinsmen as petty princes.

Quarrels that Weakened Polish Power Quarrels naturally broke out, which weakened the power of Poland. The Bohemian prince Bretislav conquered Moravia in 1029; Stefan of Hungary, Slovakia; Canute the Dane, Pomerania; and Jaroslav of Russia, the eastern half of Galicia. It was a more momentous matter that relations with Germany grew worse. Emperor Conrad II., who had been closely bound by ties of friendship with the Danish king

since 1025, adopted Besprim, the exiled elder brother of Mesko. He must also have considered the coronation of Mesko an insult. Mesko, indeed, valiantly held his ground and ravaged Saxony and other districts with the utmost ferocity in 1028 and 1030. Finally he was forced to succumb, to resign Lusatia once more, and

**The Splendour
of Boleslav
Completely Gone**

in the Merseburg treaty of 1033 to recognise in explicit terms the German suzerainty; probably also to pay tribute. The splendour which Poland had reached under Boleslav I. was completely gone. The conditions of a vassal state existed for centuries, and were more or less burdensome. We are nowhere distinctly told what constituted the duties of vassals; we may, however, consider it as certain that the Polish princes were bound to attend certain court ceremonies, to provide tribute or presents, and on the occasion of coronation journeys to Rome to supply an escort of 500, or, later, 300 soldiers. So long as ambitious ideas of empire dominated the German kings, they actually claimed the feudal rights of suzerains over Poland. It was only about the end of the thirteenth century that Poland was once for all recognised and treated as an independent state.

The political efforts of the Polish princes were naturally directed to shake off that yoke. When a favourable opportunity offered, they revolted, refused military services and tribute, seldom appeared at the court ceremonials, and here and there assumed the royal title, although in the German Empire they were styled merely "duces," or dukes. The country reached the zenith of independence under Boleslav II. at the time of Henry IV., while it sank to the lowest depth during the rule of Frederic Barbarossa and Rudolf of Hapsburg.

When Mesko II. died, in 1034, complete confusion ensued. Slaves rose against free-

**Paganism
Revives With
Civil War**

men, the semi-serfs against the nobles; churches and monasteries were plundered, and the bishops killed or banished.

Richenza, Mesko's widow, a daughter of Hermann II. of Suabia and sister of the Empress Gisela, was forced to leave Poland with her little son Casimir, and went to her home to implore help from her brother-in-law, the Emperor Conrad. The old pagan faith seems then to have once more proudly raised its head. To

fill up the cup of misery, the surrounding nations attacked and pillaged the country. Besides this Bretislav Achilles of Bohemia in 1039 carried off from Gnesen to Prague the bones of St. Adalbert, doubtless next to the booty the main object of his campaign. Boleslav I. had built up the Polish Church over the tomb of the Bohemian martyr and had deprived Bohemia of the glory of the martyrdom. How important the event was for both sides is proved by the lamentations of the Polish chroniclers, the joy with which the relics of the national saint were received at Prague, and the long trial which was held about them at Rome. Cosmas of Prague cannot find language enough to praise the prince. The holy Adalbert now became, equally with the holy Wenzel, the patron saint of Bohemia; the chief military standard of the country bore his image. Now that he possessed these relics, the Bohemian duke contemplated founding an archbishopric in Prague. It was only in the thirteenth century that Poland was able to acquire a new national saint—Stanislav.

Casimir, meanwhile, remained in Germany. In the reign of the Emperor Henry III., who gladly seized the opportunity of once again asserting imperial claims upon the East, he marched, in 1040, with 500 men to Poland in order to win back his inheritance. He found the country ruined. Wild animals had their lairs where once the cathedral of Gnesen stood. The nobles had established independent lordships in the provinces. Casimir, in order to be able to carry on war successfully, married a Russian wife and made an alliance with Hungary. The war against Bohemia was conducted with unusual energy on account of Moravia and Silesia, as well as of the plundering of the church of Gnesen.

When, by the help of Russia Casimir had won back Masovia and also Silesia, he proceeded to re-establish the decayed Polish Church. He renewed the bishoprics, and conferred the archbishopric upon his kinsman Aaron, who resided at Cracow so long as the road to Gnesen was blocked. Casimir successfully accomplished his plans by the help of Germany, whose suzerainty he acknowledged. He died in 1058. The distress and misery which Poland suffered in the first years after Mesko's death never occurred again down to the time of its overthrow. Casimir, therefore, for

THE OLD POLISH EMPIRE

his services in the restoration of the empire has been given the honourable title of "Restaurator."

The empire owes to him also a second change. Hitherto, the Polish duke had no permanent abode; he journeyed from country to country, in order to administer justice personally in every place. The duke had his throne in the town where he preferred to live.

When Casimir came to Poland he took up his quarters in Cracow, since other provinces were still to be conquered. From that time Cracow remained the residence of the duke and was, down to the sixteenth century, the political centre. This was not any advantage for the development of the empire. Posen or Gnesen would indisputably have better answered the purpose, since both lay nearer to Pomerania and the sea.

In conformity with the order of succession, introduced probably by Boleslav as king, the eldest of four sons, Boleslav II., subsequently called by the Chroniclers "the Bold," assumed the reins of government on the death of Casimir. His courage and ambitious plans recalled the memory of Boleslav I. The political situation on his accession was peculiarly



CRACOW CASTLE IN MEDIAEVAL TIMES

From the time of Casimir, who restored the Polish power in the middle of the eleventh century, until the sixteenth century, Cracow was the political centre.

to which, indeed, the future of Poland pointed. With Cracow as capital, Poland came into the disturbing vicinity of Bohemia and Hungary, and was distracted from her true aims. Apart from this disadvantage, the West Slavs were in this way more easily Germanised. The remoteness from the sea was partially remedied by the removal of the court to Warsaw.

AT THE PRESENT DAY

favourable; the dispute about the right of investiture between Henry IV and the Pope left a free hand to the Polish duke. Boleslav actually took the side of Henry's enemies, and had himself crowned at Christmas, 1076. But the scene of the struggle of the Salian with the rival kingdom was mostly the valley of the Main.

Fraught with greater consequences was Boleslav's attitude towards Stanislaw, Bishop of Cracow, whom the king, for reasons unknown to us, murdered with his own hands before the altar. This tragedy was the theme of many writers. It is also said to have been the cause of Boleslav being forced to go into exile; but the story is improbable. He died in 1081, but the place of his death is unknown. Many churches were built in honour of the murdered bishop, who was promoted in the thirteenth century

to be the first patron saint of Poland. Boleslav's successor, until 1103, at first only in Posen, while Cracow belonged to Bohemia, was his brother Vladislav Hermann, a weakling in brain and body. He was unable to take up any firm attitude either towards the nobles or his own sons, or even the Church, to which he is

A Feud Between Two Brothers said to have granted certain privileges. He divided the empire during his lifetime; while he himself retained the supreme authority, Boleslav received Masovia, Gnesen, and Posen, and his illegitimate son Sbignev Cracow and Silesia.

The smouldering feud between the two brothers burnt the more fiercely after Hermann's death, until Boleslav III. Krzywousty (Crooked Mouth) had conquered his brother's share. In spite of numerous frontier wars—for example, in 1109 the defence of Glogau against the Emperor Henry V. and Svatopluk of Olmütz—Boleslav did not secure any lasting advantage. Nor does his important place in the history of Poland depend upon the fact that he re-subjugated Pomerania and won it for Christianity by his missionaries, especially Bishop Otto of Bamberg, formerly chaplain of Vladislav Hermann; for by his very choice of a German bishop to evangelise Pomerania the Germanisation and hence the loss of Pomerania were hastened. But the Church paid him an appropriate tribute of thanks for what he had done. A priest, probably a Venetian, erroneously known by the name of Martinus Gallus, wrote in glorification of Boleslav III. the "*Chronica Polonorum*," reaching down to 1113—the oldest chronicle of Poland, and the earliest literary monument belonging to the country. The campaigns in Pomerania and the conversion of the land had the same value for Poland as the Crusades for the West. Bohemia and Poland in

Cracow Becomes the Official Centre return for their often rather forcible missionary work in pagan Pomerania and Prussia were released from the obligation of sharing in the expeditions to Palestine. The importance of Boleslav III. for Poland consists chiefly in his settlement of the order of succession to the throne. He divided his empire before his death in the following way: Vladislav, the eldest son, inherited Silesia with Glatz; Boleslav, Masovia and Kujavia with Dobrzyn;

Mesko, Gnesen and Posen with Pomerania; Henry, Sandomir; Casimir, a posthumous son, came off empty-handed. The eldest of the family was always to be Grand Duke, and reside in Cracow; to him were assigned the district of Cracow with Lenčzyca and Sieradz, besides the tribute from Pomerania and the region beyond the Oder, so that he might be superior in possessions to all other petty princes. Cracow thus became an official centre.

It is persistently asserted that Boleslav introduced with this measure the custom of seniority, according to which the eldest Piast for the time being should be the supreme head of the whole kingdom. But that is hardly correct. In the old days there was no distinction between public and private law. His scheme for the succession was not, therefore, new. Further, when, in 1054, the Bohemian duke Bretislav Achilles and Jaroslav of Kiev introduced the seniority, they only applied to the royal power the old Slavonic custom of family inheritance. The Polish duke, therefore, made use of the experience which had been gained in Bohemia and

The Wars of Boleslav's Descendants Russia. The conference of Russian princes at Lubetch, in 1097, had already declared that the petty principalities were hereditary. Boleslav now adopted this principle for his realm. The only new feature in Boleslav's scheme for the succession was that the district of Cracow remained as an appanage of the Grand Duke without any hereditary rights.

The consequences of Boleslav's settlement of the succession were the same in Poland as in Bohemia and Russia. The office of Grand Duke became, it is true, the badge and guarantee of national unity. But it also became an apple of discord among the Piasts. The sanguinary wars, which lasted among the descendants of Boleslav almost unceasingly down to the year 1333, are full of petty incidents which possess no significance in universal history; but nevertheless, like the similar wars in the families of the Premyslids, Rurikovitches, and Arpades, they supply a fresh proof that the rule of seniority was destructive to the state. When men notice that a law produces in different places the same disastrous effects, they must arrive at the consciousness that it is bad; but they have simultaneously taken a step forward. But from the circumstance that Bohemia was able to

THE OLD POLISH EMPIRE

abolish the rule of seniority in 1216, and Poland and Russia only in the fourteenth century, it may be gathered how tenaciously mankind clings to one idea, and how hard it is to strike out a new path. We also learn from it that Bohemia was more than a hundred years ahead of the above-named states in political development.

The oldest period of Polish history, when the young realm, guided mostly by strong hands and sound at the core, turned its strength toward the outside world, ends with Boleslav III., who had done homage again in 1135 to the Emperor Lothar, and died in 1138. The course of events after 1138 was exactly opposite. While the Piasts disputed among themselves for the seniority, they regarded only themselves, and lost sight of the common Polish interests in the outside world. The dispute among the sons broke out soon after the death of the father. The Grand Duke Vladislav II., of Cracow, wished once more to restore unity at the expense of his brothers.

But the threatened princes combined and asserted their claims; the law, indeed, spoke for them. Boleslav IV. (Curly-head), the eldest but one of the brothers, ascended the grand-ducal throne in the place of Vladislav, who was deprived of his share in the inheritance in 1146; and maintained his position until his death in 1173, notwithstanding that the exiled monarch sought to recover his sovereignty by the aid of Germany. After him, the third brother, Mesko III. (the Elder), became Grand Duke; and finally, after his banishment by the nobles, the originally excluded Casimir II. the Just (1179 to 1194), came to the throne, since Henry of Sandomir had already fallen. The Pope and the emperor had approved of this choice. Matters so far had gone smoothly with the succession to the throne. But the fruit

of the new order of things had already been tasted; thus Leszko I., the White, a son of Casimir, disputed the grand-ducal throne with his uncle Mesko III. Vladislav III., Longshanks, a son of Mesko

The Empire Loses Prestige III., who resided at Cracow, 1202-1206, must have equally recognised the evil latent in that law. Even the sons of the deposed Vladislav II.—Boleslav I. the Tall of Breslau, Mesko of Ratibor, and Conrad of Glogau—came forward with their claims, and not without success, after they had previously, with the help of Germany, taken possession of their inheritance.

The empire, owing to this, could not but lose all prestige with the outside world. The banished or defrauded Piasts sought help on every side, especially in Germany; each promised and performed all that was required of him in return. The dukes Vladislav II., Boleslav IV., and Mesko III., appeared in deepest submission before the German emperor; they paid tribute and fines, and furnished hostages. The Bohemian duke was, as it were, their mediator with the emperor, who usually received him with great respect.

The conquests in the north also were lost. The German princes Albert the Bear and Henry the Lion of Saxony had, in alliance with the Danish king Waldemar I., finally subjugated the north and west Slavs between the Elbe and the Oder, and had secured their territory, after 1150, by the new margraviate of Brandenburg. Not far from the place where the Slavonic Brennaburg stood, Berlin arose at the beginning of the thirteenth century.

The Pomeranian princes, who were once tributaries of Poland, were now forced to acknowledge the German sovereignty. Bogislav II. of Stettin was raised by Frederic Barbarossa, in the summer of 1181, to the dignity of a prince of the



A POLISH ROYAL TOMB IN PLOCK CATHEDRAL

empire. Only a part of Pomerania was still left for a time to Poland. For that reason also the empire would have required a free hand in order to be able to defend its interests against Russia, which was at a low ebb owing to civil wars. But thus it lost not merely the East Galician towns which Boleslav I.

The Great Power of the Nobility and Boleslav II. had once conquered, but allowed a strong Russian principality to be formed on the Dniester. The events of domestic history were far more momentous. First and foremost the power of the nobility, which composed the fighting strength, rose to an unforeseen height. The *Slachta*—the noblesse—forced even the vigorous Boleslav II. to leave the country, as his father Casimir had been obliged to do. Under Boleslav III., who was an able soldier, his Palatine Skarbimir rebelled, and was blinded as a punishment in 1117. In 1171 the nobility, under the leadership of Jakva of Miechow, rose against Boleslav IV. in order to put his brother Casimir in his place; this was the first great rebellion of the *Slachta*. Mesko the Elder fought for the princely rights in Poland, just as the son and grandson of Vladimir Monomach did in Susdal; though repeatedly driven from the throne, he mounted it again.

Besides the nobility, a second power arose in the empire—the Church. The storm of the Investitures Controversy had passed over Poland in the eleventh century almost without leaving a trace, so little power had the hierarchy in those parts; Boleslav had entered the lists against Henry IV. merely on political grounds. If we assume, with the clerical chroniclers, that Boleslav was forced to go into exile for the murder of Bishop Stanislaw, we are regarding that event from the standpoint of the thirteenth century—in the eleventh century the Polish Church was still too young to be capable of such a vengeance.

Christianity Strikes Root in Poland The pious historian of the thirteenth century pictured to himself that the wanton crime must have been expiated in some way or other. The Christian religion only slowly struck root in Poland. The first prince who was obedient to the Church was Boleslav III.; he took interest in the missions, and himself made pilgrimages to France to the tomb of St. Ægidius. During his reign the first papal legate came

to Poland in 1123-1125—from which period dates the oldest Polish document—in order to settle the boundaries of the dioceses there, establish the cathedral chapters in the sees, etc. The Polish clergy still recognised no rule of celibacy, and the prince alone nominated the bishops and removed them at his own discretion; and this state of things continued for a long time. No bishop would then have been able to oppose the prince. It was only at the period of the civil wars that the Church acquired an increasing reputation. Vladislav III. Longshanks, son of Mesko the Elder, suspecting the latent danger, obstinately resisted the claims of the clergy.

The conviction was at last brought home to the Poles, as it had been to the Bohemians and the Russians, that the only salvation for the empire lay in a hereditary monarchy. Since each of the petty princes wished to become hereditary ruler, and no one of them would give way, for a time the evil grew only worse. The ablest statesman among the Piasts of the time was undoubtedly Casimir II.

Casimir's Ability as Statesman Brought up in the German school, he grasped the true state of affairs, and therefore allied himself with the newly arisen forces, the nobility and the clergy, in order to reach his goal. Immediately after his elevation to the Grand Dukedom, probably in 1179, he convened an imperial assembly at Lenczyca, at which the clergy appeared as well as the nobles.

This was the first imperial assembly of Poland, and at the same time its first synod. Here the Church obtained the important privilege of exemption from payment of imposts and taxes to the princes. The power of the princes was checked. By this policy Casimir placed himself in opposition to the conservative line of Great Poland, which would not hear of any concessions to the Church. Casimir acted here in the same way as the Ottos when they provided a counterpoise to the dukes by the creation of the imperial ecclesiastical offices; he must have fully understood that he was dependent on the nobility. But the result was that he was supported in his efforts by the grateful Church.

Casimir also took the precaution of having his title confirmed by the Pope and the emperor; in this policy he seems to have been the model for the Bohemian dukes.

He was now able to think how to make the grand-ducal power hereditary in his family, an arrangement which was also the ambition of the Premyslids. Thus he and Mesko III. represented two opposite political schools, and friction was inevitable. But when Casimir died in 1194, it was seen that matters were in a favourable position for his children.

Vincentius, Bishop of Cracow—later surnamed Kadlubek—who voluntarily became a monk at Jedrzejow in 1218, and died in 1223, records that the clergy and nobility met in 1195 at Cracow in order to settle the question of the throne. Who had summoned them? The Chronicle

does not tell us. We learn only that the Church sided there with the house of Casimir. At the instance of Bishop Fulko of Cracow, who adroitly adduced as an argument the preference given by Pope and emperor to Casimir over Mesko, Casimir's elder son, Leszko I. (the White) was summoned to Cracow.

It was the first election of a prince in Poland; though only, as in Bohemia, from among the members of the already ruling family, the Piasts. Henceforward, with little interruption, Cracow remained until 1370—when the family died out—in the hands of the descendants of Casimir, although the hereditary monarchy had not yet been formally legalised, and contests for the throne were frequent. But it was

the will of the Church and of the nobility of Cracow. This struggle for a satisfactory constitution progressed slowly; Russia and Bohemia had not escaped it. It is an important feature in the present case that it was the Church

The Power of the Church

which solved the problem; it must have been already very powerful in Poland in the first half of the thirteenth century. Leszko, it is true, had not been able to gain any success against Mesko. But after the latter's death, in 1202, Leszko was summoned by the nobles of Cracow, and the only condition imposed upon him was

that he should remove the Palatine Govorko of Sandömir. That, instead of doing so, he preferred to abdicate the throne in favour of the son of Mesko, Vladislav Longshanks, proves how well

Conflict of Temporal and Spiritual Power

designed was the policy of the royal house. Vladislav, however, being an enemy of the Church, could not hold his own. Just at this time Henry Kietlicz, a Silesian by birth, was elected Archbishop of Poland. He had formerly studied theology at the Sorbonne in Paris with Count Lothar Conti, who mounted the papal throne on January 8th, 1198, as Innocent III.; and he had been

steeped in the plans of this mighty Pope. When placed on the archbishop's throne at Gnesen, he did not demand privileges but rights for the Polish Church. Then, for the first time there, a conflict between the temporal and spiritual powers broke out. Kietlicz was obdurate, and for the first time in Poland, apart from the dubious case of Boleslav II., launched the ban at the Grand Duke. He was forced, indeed, to flee the country, but the duke also had to leave Cracow, since the nobles of Cracow, incited by Bishop Fulko, left him in the lurch.

Leszko was then—in 1206—recalled. And he now took decisive measures for the succession. Since he first, following the example of many princes

of the time—for example, Premysl Ottokar I. of Bohemia, 1204—declared his country to be a papal fief, and then gave his brother, Conrad, Masovia and Kujavia, he contrived, with the assent of the clergy and the nobility, that Cracow and Sandömir should remain an inheritance of his family. This arrangement was confirmed by the Pope. And by it the law of seniority of Boleslav III. was formally repealed. But since this was not done with the approval of all the Piasts, the civil wars still continued. The result of the enactment, on the contrary, was that the provinces felt themselves independent of Cracow, and the unity of



POLISH WARRIOR OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

the empire seemed imperilled; but this danger was averted by the Church. Archbishop Kietlicz soon came back from Rome, and summoned a synod at Gnesen. The rule of celibacy was here introduced; and a special jurisdiction and other rights were conferred on the Church. Vladislav was therefore forced to give way. The

Under the Banner of the Christian Faith remaining petty princes followed his example. But in all these events the Archbishop of Gnesen played an inferior part to the Bishop of Cracow, for Gnesen was in another country. The wish, however, of the bishops of Cracow that the archbishopric should be removed from Gnesen to their court was not gratified.

Poland in the thirteenth century stood already definitely under the banner of the Christian faith, and the princes acknowledged the power of the Church. Casimir had made an alliance with it in 1180, and solicited Pope Alexander III. to confirm him in his title. Now, also, the canonisation of Stanislaus, Bishop of Cracow, was completed, in order that the country might have its own patron saint; with this object the old Chronicles had to be purposely falsified. Churches and monasteries sprang up everywhere. The influence of the Church was felt in every domain of public life. Boleslav, Leszko's son, practised deeds of piety and acts of penance. The princesses took the veil and won for themselves the saintly nimbus. It was Leszko's brother Conrad who fought against the pagan Prussians and summoned the order of Teutonic knights, and by so doing later brought great danger upon Poland.

When Leszko died, in 1227, and Conrad of Masovia assumed the government in the name of his infant son Boleslav the Shamefaced, or Modest, the nobles conspired against him. They made use of the Silesian Piasts, whose head at that time was Henry I. the Bearded, grandson of

An Obstinate Struggle for Cracow that Vladislav who had been expelled in 1146 from Cracow. The nobility of Cracow supported Henry, who, in spite

of his piety, was at variance with the clergy. The princes of Silesia, as well as of Great Poland, seem to have agreed together about him. Vladislav, in opposition to whom his own son Vladislav Odonicz came forward as a champion of the Church, actually designated the Silesian Henry as heir to Great Poland.

Under such circumstances Henry succeeded in uniting in his hands the greater part of the Polish dominions. It would have been a good thing for Poland if the Silesian Piasts had been able permanently to hold Cracow. But Henry I. died early in 1238; and his son Henry II., the Pious, fell gloriously on the battlefield at Liegnitz, on April 9th, 1241, in a campaign against the Mongols.

Thus once more an obstinate struggle for Cracow was kindled. Three lines of Piasts—the Silesian, the Great Polish, and the Casimirid—entered the lists. The weakest of all, Casimir's grandson, Boleslav Vstydliwy, substantiated his claim; the bishops, who were on his side, married him to a Hungarian princess, so that he was supported also by Hungary. On his death without issue the grandsons of Conrad of Masovia, Leszko the Black and Vladislav Lokietek, both of whom had estates only in Kujavia, came forward as claimants to the throne. Leszko maintained his position until 1288. The internal feuds were then at their height; each province had its own prince, who, though himself too weak, was still at war with his neighbour. After Vladislav Lokietek, who reigned only a short time, another Silesian prince, Henry IV. Probus of Breslau, took possession of Cracow (1289–1290). In the true spirit of patriotism he selected Przemyslav of Great Poland, a grandson of Odonicz, to inherit his dominions. But others came forward as rivals. The most dangerous was the Bohemian king Wenzel II. He married, in 1287, as his first wife, Jutta, a daughter of the German king Rudolf I. of Hapsburg; perhaps the object in view was a union of Poland with Bohemia under the overlordship of Germany. Cracow was taken by Bohemia in the year 1291. Przemyslav, it is true, in order to notify the independence of the crown of all the Polands, had himself crowned king of Poland at Gnesen in 1295; but he died the next year, 1296. Wenzel conquered Great Poland, and had himself crowned king of Poland in 1300. His death, in 1305, alone saved the independence of Poland; but the kings of Bohemia henceforward bore the title of "Rex Poloniae." The native candidates for the throne were finally beaten by Vladislav Lokietek, brother of Leszko the Black. When he was himself crowned at Gnesen, in January, 1320, with the consent

THE OLD POLISH EMPIRE

of the Pope, the union of Poland was once more safeguarded, and with it the era of hereditary monarchy had dawned. More than two hundred years had elapsed before the Polish nation, by great sacrifices and hard struggles, had won the suitable form of government.

The Polish nation, which had bled to gratify the ambition of her princes, while defiant nobles claimed a share in the government, had seen her most prosperous days irrevocably ruined through civil wars. We can best estimate her loss by her relations to her neighbours.

The position of Poland towards Germany had become unfavourable. It was only when Germany, weakened by long wars, had, under Rudolf I. of Hapsburg, abandoned all notions of world empire, that a more prosperous era dawned for Poland. It was only to the turn of events in other countries, and to the battles which had been fought in the West between emperor and Pope, and not to their own efficiency, that the Piasts of Poland owed their independence from Germany. The Bohemian relations of Poland were important,

The Common Menace of Germany and, in fact, decisive for her policy. We first find the two states in friendly relations one to the other; Mesko I. married a Bohemian princess. The common menace of Germany had probably brought them closer together. It then happened that the two princes quarrelled with each other because the Polish prince had robbed the Bohemian of a province (Moravia or Cracow). The emperor, it is true, decided in favour of Bohemia, but could not force Poland to accept his arbitration.

This mutual hostility forms a pivot of the future policy of Bohemia and Poland. Bohemia openly joined the German Empire, and, relying on this, wished to make conquests; the only place left for Poland was in the camp of its enemies. In the year 1003 Boleslav I. of Poland succeeded in making himself master of Bohemia. The union of these two kingdoms would have been of far-reaching importance for the whole Slavonic world, but Germany could not and would not tolerate the subjugation of her vassal. Poland was forced to liberate Bohemia.

The capture of Prague only increased the hatred of the two nations. Bretislav of Bohemia then conquered Moravia, and carried off to Prague the bones of

St. Adalbert. Silesia and Cracow fell for a time under Bohemian rule. Polish refugees were welcomed in Bohemia, and those of Bohemia in Poland. There was almost uninterrupted fighting in the forests on the Silesian frontier. The same jealousy was apparent in the ecclesiastical domain. Bohemia wished to have its

Rivalries of Poland and Bohemia archbishopric, like Poland. Bohemia took part in Prussian missionary work, but only in rivalry with Poland. The words, therefore, of the Polish Chronicle of the so-called Martinus Gallus, "the Bohemians are the worst enemies of Poland," have a deep significance.

It was only in the thirteenth century that this hostility decreased, principally through the efforts of Premysl Ottokar II. The hatred of Germany had now brought the two countries together. It was Ottokar who first appealed to the Slavonic fellow-sympathies of the Poles when he prepared for a decisive campaign against Germany. But Bohemia was too closely associated with the empire, and already too far removed from the Slavonic spirit, for this step to have any prospect of success. Poland was weaker, but since she was always opposed to Germany, the day of her independence would eventually dawn. While Bohemia, however, in connection with Germany, developed more peacefully and under able kings attained some importance, Poland sank deeper and deeper. Poland formerly had assumed the aggressive towards Bohemia, but now the two neighbours had exchanged their rôles. Bohemia obtained Moravia and extended her influence over Silesia. In fact, Bohemia, the direction of whose plans was defined by the northern course of the Elbe and Oder, had formed still wider plans. If the Bohemian princes repeatedly warred with Prussia, and if Wenzel II. conquered Cracow, the incentive to such action must have been the Baltic. Poland

Relations of Poland and Hungary barred the way thither. The relations of Poland and Hungary were quite different. Once only had the sovereigns of the two kingdoms faced each other as foes—when Boleslav I. took Slovakia, and at the same time contested with Stefan in Rome for the royal crown. In later times the interests of the two countries seldom conflicted. Hungary went down the Danube south-eastwards; Poland struggled to reach the Baltic.

Owing to this divergence of their aims, quite friendly relations were often afterwards developed.

The state of things on the Baltic Sea became dangerous for Poland at the time of the civil wars. The Polish princes of Kujavia and Masovia were unable to defend themselves against the pagan

Power of the Pagan Prussians Prussians. The popes, indeed, were solicitous about their conversion; crusades were preached, and an order of knights was founded in Dobrzyn. But that was of little avail. Conrad of Masovia and Kujavia, therefore, summoned the Teutonic knights and assigned to them some districts in 1226. Hermann of Salza did not, however, content himself with the deed of gift of the Piast, but obtained that district as a fief from the Emperor Frederic II. and Pope Gregory IX.; the latter, in fact, freed the territory of the Order from all except papal overlordship.

Thus secured on all sides the Order began the war with the Prussians, supported by the knights of Western Europe, and especially those of Germany; the princes of Bohemia, Poland, and Pomerania also sent help. Success came rapidly; Prussia was soon conquered and secured by fortresses. But it was soon apparent that the Order had its own interests, not those of Poland, in view. Duke Svatopluk of Pomerania soon confronted the Order and protected Prussia. The Polish princes, however, had claimed the help of the knights against Brandenburg, which wished to have Pomerania. But the Order, when once brought into Pomerania, was unwilling to evacuate the country. In the same year, 1309, the Teutonic knights removed their chief centre from Venice to Marienburg. Thus there arose here a dangerous neighbour, supported by Germany and the Pope, which threatened to cut off Poland from the sea. The only hope left was, that now Lithuania was

Irresponsibility of the Polish Sovereign developing to the east of the Order, it certainly lay with Poland to make the best use of this turn of events.

Poland was equally unable to guard her interests in Russia. This position was now all the more dangerous, since after the subjugation of her eastern neighbour by the Tartars, the way to Poland lay open to the latter, and often enough have the Tartars ravaged Polish countries. Equally gloomy was the position at that

time of the internal state of Poland, both in respect of legal and economic developments and with regard to general culture. The person of the prince and his court constituted the centre of public life. The prince was the supreme administrator, judge, and general; he was formally absolute and irresponsible. He nominated the higher officials, who represented his rights; such were the court-judge and under-court-judge, the marshal and under-marshal, the chamberlain and under-chamberlain, seneschal and under-seneschal, carver, etc. At their head stood the palatine, or *wojewoda*. It cannot now be determined which offices dated from the pagan times and how far the court may have been altered later; the offices of chancellor and court secretary were certainly only creations of the Christian age.

The administration was simple. The country was divided into Castellannies: each Castellan exercised in his own division all the rights of the prince. The Castellannies were divided into smaller districts, or *opola*, which, probably dating

Grievous Pressure of Taxation from the oldest time, continued in existence until the thirteenth century. But more important for the people were the treasury and the law court. It is difficult to distinguish accurately between the fiscal dues which the freemen and serfs, who resided on the crown lands, were required to pay, and those which were payable to the royal coffers from other lands. The dues required consisted of payments in kind and in compulsory services, and there was a long list. A plough tax, a court tax, and a peace tax are first mentioned; we find also dues on honey, corn, cows, oxen, sheep, swine, etc. The subjects had to discharge public duties; they were, for instance, bound to build and restore the castles and bridges, and compelled to dig moats, mount watch in the castles and courts, furnish the prince and his officials with horses and carriages, guides and escorts, to hunt down criminals and clear the forests, and so forth.

Most burdensome was the obligation to receive and board messengers and officials, hunters, falconers, the keepers of the royal horses and hounds, their brewers, bakers, fishermen, etc., and supply food for the hounds and fodder for the horses. Even the butchers were bound

THE OLD POLISH EMPIRE

to hand over to the royal falconers the livers of the animals which they slaughtered. Besides this the prince claimed all unoccupied lands, all hunting-grounds and fisheries, all castles and towns, tolls and coinage rights, mills and the sale of salt, markets and court fees, etc. No considerable deviations from the oppressive burdens of the feudal system in Western Europe are observable. If we bear in mind also that abuses in the system occurred, that, for instance, when horses were required, they were taken from any place, but were often not restored, we shall understand that the people were completely at the mercy of the prince and his officials.

Equally unfavourable to the people was the judicial system. The inhabitants of each district, or *opole*, were collectively responsible for any crimes, and in the event of a murder which had been committed on its soil it paid the indemnity, and also was under the obligation of prosecuting the criminals. Since, with the exception of the death penalty or mutilation, there were only fines, that is to say, court dues,

Oppression by Provincial Princes the courts themselves became a sort of fiscal institution. As long as the kingdom was still undivided and large, all burdens were still more or less endurable. But the position became worse, and finally intolerable, when after the partition every prince kept up in his own province a court with a crowd of officials. To crown all, the nobles and clergy struggled more and more, as time went on, to free themselves from these obligations, while they obtained the corresponding privileges. They released themselves from the system of the *opole*, and, by so doing, from its collective responsibility, jurisdiction, and taxation. In this way private lordships, almost tax free as regards the treasury, with their own jurisdiction, and their own system of taxation, were formed by the side of the *opole*. The whole burden of the kingdom was shifted on to the peasants. The clergy and nobility became rich, while the people and the peasantry were impoverished.

The old Slavonic law and the earlier enactments were so riddled by these privileges that they became almost impracticable. The necessary change came in the shape of the German colonisation. The circumstance that the Piasts, especially in Silesia, married German

princesses, who came to Poland with a German suite, must have contributed to increase the German element in Poland, just as in the adjoining country of Hungary. The economic distress, however, was the decisive cause. In order to fill the treasury, princes, as well as monasteries and nobles, brought into the country

Success of German Settlers

German settlers from the more densely inhabited West in order to gather the produce of the fields. The superiority and the lasting influence of the foreign colonists lay less in the fact that the Germans knew better how to cultivate the soil rather than in their more favourable legal position. The colonists, who were brought into the country by a contractor, received a plot of ground as an hereditary property, with certain minor rights and privileges, and had in return merely to pay a definite annual sum to the lord of the manor.

This privileged position was bound to promote their prosperity and to strengthen in them that feeling of self-reliance which they had brought with them as subjects of the German Empire, to which Poland was tributary. The relation of the immigrant to the native was the same in Bohemia and Russia. The strong political position of Germany benefited the settlers of that day as much as it benefits the German merchants and artisans of our times. Foreigners were promoted by the Slavonic princes to the detriment of their own people. The princes were too short-sighted to see that in this way they fostered in their own people that sense of humiliation which has been felt for centuries and has found its expression in legends, songs, and other forms of literature.

On the other hand, the Germans, who had the means at their disposal, were always in the position to pursue further developments of culture. The feelings of the Slavonic population, mortified and ignored by their own princes, either unburdened themselves in hatred for the quite innocent German element and in rebellions against the authorities, or found a vent in emigration. On the other hand, the people took refuge in the protection of the German law; Polish villages and towns under the Slavonic law wished, in order to increase their prosperity, to be "promoted" to the German law. German customs, language, and culture would obviously spread rapidly under these

The Slavs' Way to Prosperity

conditions. The devastations of the Tartars and the civil wars helped on the German colonisation. Silesia was soon completely Germanised, and in other provinces the German element at any rate grew steadily stronger. If the Silesian Piasts succeeded in temporarily driving the Casimirids from the throne of Cracow,

Towns as Centres of National Life they owed that in no small degree to the support of their German subjects. A Germanisation of the entire Polish state lay already within the range of probability. A national crisis now took the place of the economic crisis which had been partially relieved by the German colonisation. This was the more dangerous since the Teutonic knights had now formed a third party in the country by the side of the Germans and the empire.

This situation was especially gloomy for Poland and all Slavs, since it was no longer the courts and castles of the ruling class, but rather the towns, that formed the centres of political, economic, and social life. The Slavs had, however, adopted their municipal organisation directly from the Germans, who were far ahead of them in this respect, and they usually found that their requirements in culture were satisfied to a far higher degree among the Teutons than among the Latins.

Such was the state of affairs in Poland when, in 1320, Vladislav Lokietek was crowned king in Cracow. The removal of all abuses in the interior of the realm, the improvement of the administration and judicature, the revision of the system of taxation, the establishment of equitable relations between the various sections of the people, the restraint of the Germanising movement, the encouragement of culture, and the protection of the realm against foreign attacks—such was the task of the restored monarchy. It was the more difficult since Poland had no

Poland Without a Friend friend, or, at the most, some moderate support from the Roman Curia, which was again in conflict with the empire. Lokietek saw clearly that the Teutonic Order was the most dangerous enemy of Poland. He therefore sued the knights in the Roman Curia respecting Pomerania. He formed an alliance with Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, and married his daughter Elizabeth to the Hungarian king, Charles Robert the Angevin. He also succeeded

in gaining the friendship of Lithuanian princes, who were already hostile to the Order. In 1325 he married his son Casimir to Aldona, daughter of the warlike Lithuanian Gedymin. Thus strengthened, he advanced himself against the Order. The first engagements proved favourable to him. But the results were temporarily unimportant; and the Roman suit brought him no advantage. This was due partly to the hostile attitude of King John of Bohemia, who could not disguise his impulse toward the North. John so far accomplished his purpose between the years 1327 and 1331, that most of the Silesian princes did homage to him; and he undertook a campaign against Lithuania, receiving on the way the homage of a Masovian prince. The Hungarian assistance, which Lokietek received, alone checked the Bohemian king from further steps. In spite of all this, the neighbouring states noticed that the position of Poland was strengthened when Lokietek died in 1333.

Work enough was left for his son Casimir. Lokietek had, it is true, already restored to a large extent the unity of the empire, and its independence was actually acknowledged by the Holy Roman Empire. But Poland, which had hardly been cemented together, was so exhausted that it could be permanently saved only by a strong hand. Casimir proved himself the wished-for strong king. The times had changed. The formerly despotic ruler had now to share his power with the priests and the nobles. By the side of these the towns rose continuously victorious. Chivalry soon lost its peculiar value; on the one hand, firearms had been invented; on the other, the ideas and objects of men changed with the growing prosperity of trades and industries. The laws, the military system, and the government required reform; they were to suit the conditions of a new era.

Casimir was competent for his task; with unerring eye he recognised that chivalry was nearing its end; and he did not fritter his time away in tournaments as King John did, but turned his attention with all the greater zeal to important economic, political, and social questions. Thus, in 1335, making full use of the favourable situation, he concluded with John of Bohemia the treaty of Visegrad. John abandoned his claims on Poland, in

THE OLD POLISH EMPIRE

return for which Casimir paid him 120,000 Bohemian groschen, and recognised the Bohemian suzerainty over Silesia and Plock.

Casimir's relations with the Teutonic Order did not turn out so favourably for Poland. The kings of Bohemia and Hungary decided in favour of the knights; the Roman Curia played a double game. Thus Pomerania, which was lost, could be won back only by the sword. Casimir must have been resolved on this, since he concluded a treaty with Charles Robert of Hungary, in 1339, at Visegrád. Having

no male issue, he promised the succession in Poland to Lewis, the son of the latter and his own nephew, on the understanding that Lewis would win back the lost provinces, especially Pomerania, would fill the offices and high posts only with Poles, would impose no new taxes, and would respect the ancient privileges. The purport of this hereditary alliance was certainly hostile to the Order. But Casimir's attention was turned in another direction.

When the childless Prince Boleslav Troidenovicz was poisoned in Halicz by the Boyars, Casimir was bound to interfere if he did not wish that the Lithuanians or the Tartars should seize the country and thus become his immediate neighbours. When Casimir took Halicz and Lemberg, in 1340, the Lithuanians occupied Volhynia; an event of the greatest importance for all Eastern Europe. Even the question of the Teutonic Order at once became less weighty and urgent for Poland. In 1343 Casimir concluded a treaty with the knights at Kalisch, by which he ceded to them Pomerania and the region of Michelau and Chelm, while

he recovered only Kujavia and Dobrzyn. Half voluntarily Poland thus barred her own access to the Baltic Sea. But in return there was the glimpse of hope in the future of pressing onwards to the East, of reaching perhaps the Black Sea, and, finally, through the increase of power there acquired, of wreaking vengeance on her old foes, and winning back the provinces lost to Bohemia and the Teutonic Order.

Perhaps this goal hovered before Casimir's eyes when he concluded, in 1339,



CASIMIR THE GREAT OF POLAND

Casimir III. came to the Polish throne at a time when nothing but the iron hand of a strong ruler could have saved the country from disintegration, and proved himself the wished-for man of power. He carried forward many reforms, and greatly advanced his country's prosperity.

the settlement of the succession with Hungary; there were then clear signs of ferment in the region of Halicz. At first, however, Casimir was unfortunate; the war with Lithuania and the Tartars was by no means easy. It was only towards 1366 that he permanently secured Lemberg, Halicz, and a part of Volhynia for Poland. Meanwhile he had also reconquered a part of Silesia; the Prince of Masovia also took the oath of fealty to him. He still, however, bore the title "Heir to Pomerania"; a proof that he continued to think about that country.

But it was not in his conquests and his advancement of his realm that the true greatness of Casimir lay, but in his administration and organisation. He would not have been able to achieve any political successes had he not been intent on internal reform. In the first place, he gave Poland, which had hitherto been only a personal union of distinct countries, a centralised organisation. He unified the administration by creating new imperial offices in addition to the local offices which had existed since the times of the petty principalities. He then proceeded to improve the judicial system. He first of all

ordered the customary law, which was preserved only in oral tradition and naturally was different in the different districts, to be written down, and then had a universal code prepared for all Polish countries. He allowed the flourishing towns which lived according to the code of Kulm or Magdeburg to retain their laws,

**Casimir
Fosters National
Feeling**

but forbade any appeal to the mother towns outside the kingdom. He substituted a superior court of

German law in every district, which decided cases according to the principles of the Magdeburg Code and the Sachsenspiegel; the magistrates of all the German villages were subordinated to this court. As the tribunal of highest instance for all local courts he established the Supreme Court of Justice at Cracow in 1356, at the head of which stood the governor of Cracow and a royal procurator-general, with seven qualified lawyers as assessors. The towns were in this way severed from Germany, and since they gradually lost any tendency to become Germanised, the national feelings of Poland were cautiously fostered and developed.

It seemed as if Casimir from the same motives had specially favoured the nobility, in order to prevent the German town element from acquiring political importance. The arrogance of the *slachta* certainly increased from the fact of his taking the advice of assemblies of nobles; indeed, there was actually formed among the nobility a league whose head suffered the death penalty by order of the king on account of outrages which had been committed. The king, however, continued to regard the nobles as the advisers of the crown. This tendency was visible in the actions of his successors; the national opposition between Poles and Germans was then very strong.

The reorganisation of the military system was not less important. Hitherto

**Poland's
New Military
System**

only the wealthy nobles had furnished troops, since the cost of equipment was heavy and the landowning clergy

were exempt from the duty. Casimir now decided that for the future, in order to raise the sunken state of the army, the duty of service should be imposed upon all possessors of land. Thus the citizen became equally available for the army; the clergy had to send substitutes. Regulations as to levying troops were also drawn

up. In addition to this he ordered that stone fortresses should be constructed everywhere in place of wooden; he transformed churches into castles—hence the Polish *kosciol*, Bohemian *kostel*, in the sense of church—and built good roads. The later successes of Poland were considerably influenced by these military reforms.

He took steps no less effective to advance the trade of the country, since he conferred special privileges on the towns, guaranteed security of person and property to foreign merchants, and gave them rights, built roads and bridges, founded markets, multiplied the number of fairs, opened up trade-routes into the interior, extirpated brigandage, and, what was the most important point, introduced a uniform coinage. The prosperity of the kingdom suddenly revived, and the reputation of the king grew so greatly that he was chosen to arbitrate between the Emperor Charles IV. and King Lewis of Hungary. The former of these sovereigns married at Cracow, as his fourth wife, Casimir's grand-daughter Elizabeth, and

**Poland
Rich and
Civilised**

a daughter of Boguslav V. of Pomerania. On this occasion Casimir gave his guests, the kings of Hun-

gary, Bohemia, Cyprus, and Denmark, a brilliant reception. The event is described in the "Chronica Cracoviæ" of John of Czarnkov, Archdeacon of Gnesen.

Casimir put the coping-stone on his labours when he founded, in 1364, a university at Cracow. Now, for the first time, Poland entered the ranks of civilised states, and could now perform her duty in the east of Europe. He considered in this scheme the interests of all classes, nations, and creeds. He protected the peasants from the nobles, and was therefore called the Peasants' King. He granted rights to Armenians, Jews, and others. Himself a Roman Catholic, he nevertheless instructed the Byzantine patriarch to found bishoprics in his Russian dominions.

When Casimir died in 1370 the formerly exhausted and despised Poland was a rich and respected civilised state. The old dynasty of the Piasts became extinct with him. And with him also closes the first great era of Polish history. In conformity with the arrangement which had been made respecting the succession, King Lewis of Hungary took over the government. Piasts still ruled, it is



POLAND UNDER HUNGARY. CORONATION AT CRACOW OF THE ANOINTED KING STEPHEN I OF HUNGARY AS KING OF POLAND.

true, in the petty principality of Masovia, but Casimir had been forced to exclude from the succession these ultra-conservative and insignificant relations, in the interests of the realm, which could attain greater importance only in alliance with a second power. The reign of the Angevin Lewis brought no prosperity to the country of Poland, which was regarded merely as an appanage of Hungary.

After his coronation in Cracow Lewis returned home with the Polish royal insignia, and sent his mother Elizabeth, the sister of Casimir, to Poland to act as his regent. He thought only of securing the crown of Poland for one of his daughters, since he had no male heirs, who alone were regarded in the succession treaty by Casimir. The agreement with the Polish nobles was signed at Kaschau in 1374. The king, in return, pledged himself to reconquer the lost Polish provinces, to remit the dues of the nobility except the sum of two groschen from each plough, to confer all offices only on Poles of the district concerned, and to give special pay to the military for service

rendered outside the borders of the country. He was not concerned by the thought that the military and fiscal strength of Poland was thus much reduced and that the nobility were expressly recognised as the dominant influence; indeed, he actually united Red Russia with the Hungarian throne, and sent his own governor thither. He it was, also, who largely promoted the Roman Catholic propaganda in the Russian territory, and thus generated a movement which not only cost Hungary Red Russia, but later proved most disastrous to Poland also.

The arrogance of the nobility increased during his reign, and with it disorders in the country, so much that there was no longer any justice. The property of the poor was continually plundered by the Captains and Burggraves. And when, after large payments to the Chancery, a petitioner came back from Hungary with a royal letter, the noble brigands took no notice of it at all. Merchants and travellers were continually robbed and plundered on the high-roads without the slightest interference on the part of the Captains.



GROUP OF POLISH PEASANTS AND OTHER NATIVES OF POLAND



WHEN KNIGHTHOOD WAS IN FLOWER LITHUANIA TO THE UNION WITH POLAND

ON the southern shores of the Baltic, where Nature has not marked any sharply defined limits landwards, the Slavs, Finns, and Lithuanians influenced each other reciprocally. In the first place, the Slavs, who were the earliest to found states in those parts, ruled the others. Thus, Poland, following the course of the Vistula, turned against the Prussian Lithuanians in order to set foot on the Baltic. We find the Finnish Livonians at an early period of history the vassals of the Russian princes of Polock, who ruled the whole course of the Dwina as far as the sea. The Esthonians finally became dependent on the Novgorodian Slavs on the Lake of Ilmen, who founded there Jurjev, or Dorpat, and other towns.

But when Russia became weakened by civil wars, and the princes of Polock could not, therefore, assert their authority over the tribes on the Dwina, other nations tried to gain a firm footing there.

Danes and Swedes in Livonia The country was more accessible from the sea than from the interior of the continent of Eastern Europe, and could not escape the influence of those nations who navigated the Baltic Sea. The Danes were the first to try to settle in Livonia. The Swedes also, who navigated the whole Baltic coast and established a large emporium at Wisby on the island of Gotland, came into contact with the Finnish tribes in Livonia and Esthonia. But even they failed to achieve permanent successes.

The situation changed only when the German trading towns of the North came into prominence. Lübeck also possessed an emporium and trading factories at Wisby, but then tried to come into direct communication with the Finnish tribes without Swedish intervention. The German ship that had sailed to seek out these tribes was driven by a storm into the Gulf of Riga. The natives flocked together, as the older Livonian Rhymed Chronicle tells us, and attacked the

Germans. But when they were beaten off, they proffered peace and began to trade by barter. The founding of the castle Uxküll, usually assigned to the year 1143, really dates from four decades later. This first contact of Germans with

The Grandeur of the Great Bishop Otto

Livonians, Lithuanians, and Slavs was due purely to a commercial policy. But it did not continue so. The races of Western Europe were then permeated by a deep religious feeling. The paganism of the Finnish and Lithuanian tribes attracted attention. The awakening missionary zeal found supporters in Germany the more readily since it promised to be remunerative both in its political and economic aspects.

The first missionary of the Prussians was St. Adalbert, who enjoyed the protection of Poland. Twelve years after him, St. Bruno of Querfurt also found a martyr's death there. Boleslav III. Krzywousty carried on the work of conversion in Pomerania and Prussia on a larger scale. The man in whom he confided, Bishop Otto of Bamberg, in contrast to other missionaries who went barefooted and shabbily dressed, appeared among the Pomeranians as a mighty prince, with a brilliant suite, and supported by the Polish army. He gave beautiful clothes and other presents to the newly baptised, and met with great success.

Henry Zdik, Bishop of Olmütz, then resolved to preach the Gospel to the Prussians in the footsteps of St. Adalbert, and applied to the Curia in 1140. But it was not until 1144, when preparations were being made for the Second Crusade, that Pope Lucius II. negotiated with Henry about a Prussian mission. It was then determined that Bohemia, Poland, and other northern kingdoms should not be obliged to join expeditions to the Holy Land, but should undertake the conversion of the Prussians instead. The

moravian princes, therefore, undertook, with Bishop Henry, a crusade against the Prussians in 1147. They were joined by German and Polish princes. This event may have ripened the plans at the Bohemian court for expanding in a northerly direction at the cost of Poland, and obtaining a footing on the Baltic by building castles, etc. The

**Prussia's
Preference for
Its Old Gods**

Prussians obstinately defended their old gods and their liberty. They improved their methods of warfare, and even ventured on invading Kujavia and Masovia.

During the course of these events the Danes turned their attention to the Wends, and the Swedes to Finland, Livonia and Esthonia. Abbot Peter of Rheims marked out for the Finnish mission his pupil Fulko, who was consecrated bishop by the Archbishop of Lund. Pope Alexander III. gave his sanction to the plan in 1169, and conferred indulgences on all Scandinavians who would join the war against the Esthonians. Fulko was not, however, adequately supported by either side. The Christian propaganda of the Scandinavians generally met with no success.

Abbot Arnold of Lübeck, who is generally supposed to have continued the Slavonic Chronicle of Helmod, relates that Meinhard, a priest, came with the Germans to Livonia, and was the first to try to preach the Gospel to the Livonians. When he found that the harvest was good, he applied to the Archbishop of Bremen, in 1186, to inaugurate a mission on a grand scale; he also asked the Prince of Polock to allow the mission. As a reward for his successful energy in building a church and a castle at Uxküll, founding of convents, etc., the Archbishop of Bremen consecrated him Bishop of Uxküll. But when tithes were exacted from the Livonians, and they noticed their dependence on Bremen, they attacked Uxküll and dived

**Livonians
Abandon
Christianity**

into the Dwina to wash off their baptism. Meinhard, who could not leave the castle, sent his vicar, Dietrich, as an envoy to Rome, and died in 1196. His successor, Berthold, reached Livonia with an army of Crusaders, but was defeated by the Livonians in 1198.

All the baptised Livonians abandoned Christianity; they threw into the sea a wooden image which they thought to be the German god of destruction.

The Archbishop of Bremen now sent Albert of Bukshövden, in 1198, as bishop to Uxküll. King Canute of Denmark, Pope Innocent III., and several princes supported him. A crusading force of twenty-three ships now came to Livonia. The Livonians assumed the defensive, but Albert had recourse to stratagem. After concluding an armistice, he invited the oldest Livonians to a banquet, and did not let them go free until they gave their children as hostages, and promised acceptance of Christianity. The opposition of the Livonians was broken down, the children were sent to Bremen to be educated, and the Gospel was preached everywhere. In 1201, for greater security, he removed the bishopric from Uxküll to the town of Riga, which had been newly fortified by him, and lay nearer to the sea.

He then, in order to create a fighting force for himself, divided the land as fiefs among such Crusaders as were willing to settle there. When the news of the founding of Riga was spread, Esthonians, Livonians, Courlanders, and Lithuanians came to conclude peace. In order to secure absolutely the work of conversion,

**Surrender
of
Livonia**

Albert founded, in 1202, a new knightly order for Livonia on the model of the Templars. These *fratres militie Christi* wore white cloaks with a red cross and sword on the left breast, and were therefore called *fratres ensiferi*, or *gladiferi*, sword-wielders, the order of the sword. They were subject to the temporal and spiritual jurisdiction of the bishops of Riga. The master had his seat in the newly built Wenden.

In the year 1207, Albert surrendered Livonia to the Emperor Philip of Suabia as a fief. The real conquest now began. The Livonians first, and then the Letts were subjugated. The Russian principality of Polock, to which the country on the Dwina paid tribute (the two principalities of Kukenojs and Gersike belonged to it), attempted, it is true, to enforce its rights by help of the Esthonians, but it was too weak. Even Kukenojs and Gersike were conquered by the Germans, and the name of the latter soon disappears from history, although Albert agreed to the payment of a tribute for Livonia to Polock.

It was now the turn of Esthonia. The district of Sakkala, with Fellin, was first conquered then Ungaunia. Here,



THEATRE BOULEVARD, WITH POST OFFICE AND POLICE STATION



THE GREAT PONTOON BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIVER DWINA



THE ORTHODOX GREEK CATHEDRAL OF RIGA

Founded in 1210, Riga presents a mixture of ancient and modern features. The old town still preserves the aspects of a Medieval city, and there are to be seen many magnificent buildings of an early date. In 1621, Riga was captured for Sweden by Gustavus Adolphus, and, in 1710, Peter the Great took it for Russia. The illustrations give a good impression of the city and its buildings.

VIEWS OF RIGA THE ANCIENT CAPITAL OF LIVONIA

however, Novgorod, to which the Esthonians paid tribute, and which had built Jurjev in those parts in 1030, came into the question. The princes also of Pskow, with the help of Novgorod, inflicted defeats on the Germans. Albert therefore turned, in 1218, to King Waldemar II. of Denmark. The Esthonians were

The Danes beaten in 1219. The Danes
Founders founded then the town and
of Reval castle of Reval, and placed a bishop there, who was subordinate to the Archbishopric of Lund. The Danes and the Germans now vied with each other in the conversion of the country. The Livonian Order protested against the Danish conquest. Albert lodged charges against Waldemar in Rome and before the German Emperor, all in vain. Waldemar offered Esthonia as a fief to the Pope; the Emperor Frederic II. was involved in the preparations for a crusade. Albert was compelled, therefore, to recognise the supremacy of Denmark over Esthonia. But since Waldemar, his attention being engrossed elsewhere, abandoned the conquered countries to their fate, the Germans were able to recover their strength. In the year 1224 they took Jurjev, although it had been obstinately defended by the Prince Wjatko. Albert then conquered the islands of Mon and Oesel. The Order attacked Reval and other Danish possessions. Even the Courlanders and Semgallians on the left bank of the Dwina were subjugated in the lifetime of Albert. The Order received, after the year 1207, a third of the conquered countries for its maintenance. When Albert died, in 1229, the sovereignty of the bishopric and the Order extended over the whole of Courland, Livonia, and Esthonia.

The successes of the Livonian Order drew the attention of all the northern states to it. The Polish prince, Conrad of Masovia and Kujavia, whose dominions had been cruelly raided by the pagan

Preaching Prussians and were being
to the Pagan overrun by the Lithuanians,
Prussians formed a scheme of founding a similar knighthood. At

that time Christian, a monk of the Cistercian monastery in Oliva, late Suffragan Bishop of Mainz, was preaching the Gospel to the Prussians. Pope Honorius III., to whom he appealed for assistance, raised him to the Bishopric of Lithuania and recommended him to the Archbishop of Gnesen. On his return to Prussia he could not, however,

maintain his position. Even Conrad was compelled to leave his principality. In his straits he founded an "Order of Christ," and assigned to it the territory of Dobrzyn; hence also the name "Dobrinian Order." But this Order also failed to hold its own.

Conrad now turned to the Teutonic Order, which just at this time, 1225, was expelled from Transylvania by King Andreas of Hungary. The Grand Master Hermann of Salza accepted his offer, and received as territory the district of Kulm and the regions still to be conquered. The Order took all this in 1226 as a fief from the Emperor Frederic, and thus continued to make itself independent of the Masovian prince.

In the year 1228 Hermann Balk, the first territorial master, appeared in Prussia with a strong force of knights under the banner of the Blessed Virgin. The heathen, who were still disunited and carried on the war in bands, were driven back step by step. Good roads were laid down everywhere, and castles built. Thus, first of all, Thorn arose, then Kulm, Marienwerder and Elbing. The Prussian children were taken away and sent to

The Teutonic Germany to be educated.
Order's The pagans offered, indeed,
Great Power an obstinate resistance. But the German knights were supported by the whole of Europe, while the Prussians found only here and there some slight help from their fellow tribesmen in Lithuania.

While the Teutonic Order thus grew stronger, the news suddenly came from Livonia that the Order in that country, being inadequately supported by the West and threatened by an overwhelming force of Livonians, Danes and Russians, was on the verge of being dissolved. In order to save the new offshoot, it was proposed to combine the two foundations. The Knights of the Sword were incorporated in the Teutonic Order in 1237, adopted its badges and dress, and henceforward formed a province of the Teutonic Order, without, however, disowning their duties toward the Bishop of Riga and the Prince of Polock. The amalgamation was advantageous for both parties. A powerful German state was now formed on the southern coast of the Baltic, to which the Lithuanians, Finns and Slavs were subordinated. Its superiority in culture, warfare, and government soon made the Order a menace to the Russians and the Poles.

LITHUANIA TO THE UNION WITH POLAND

Knights flocked to the territory of the Order from all parts of Europe. Luxury and magnificence, with a constant round of brilliant tournaments and banquets, were the order of the day at Marienburg, the seat of the Grand Master, and in the other castles. Possibly no royal court in Europe, not excepting that of the emperor himself, offered such pleasures and distractions to the knights as the court of Marienburg. This was the training college for the young knights, who naturally went there in preference to Palestine. Every year foreign knights assembled in the domains of the Order to take part in the campaigns. "Journeys" were made to Lithuania, when the lakes and morasses were frozen. The country was completely ravaged, the inhabitants were carried off, and the villages burnt. The Lithuanians then did the same, only in larger

up in consequence of the dissensions of the princely family and with the popular assemblies, the contending parties often called in the help of their neighbours, and in this way Lithuania was drawn into Russian affairs. By the first half of the thirteenth century Lithuanian principalities had arisen on Russian soil. Towards

"Black Russia"
the Prize
of Battle

the middle of the thirteenth century Mendog, or Mindove, came into prominence as ruler of Lithuania.

He appears to have been the first who, as "Grand Duke" treated the other petty princes as vassals. But his position was difficult. Not only did the lords of Halicz and Vladimir fight against him for the possession of Black Russia, but his kinsmen pressed on him still more heavily. Even the people, dissatisfied with his imperious policy, turned against him; the



THE CASTLE OF REVAL, THE PRINCIPAL CITY OF ESTHONIA

The history of Reval dates back to the thirteenth century, when it was founded as a Danish town. It was sold, in 1310, to the Teutonic knights by Denmark; it became Swedish in 1561, and in 1710 it was captured by Peter the Great.

numbers, since the domains of the Order were thickly populated and studded with castles. The Teutonic knights succeeded after a time in winning a party for themselves among the Lithuanians; the wealthier and shrewder pagans were forced ultimately to acknowledge that Christianity was better, the culture of the Order higher, and their way of life more pleasant. At the moment when the danger from the Teutonic Order was the greatest, Lithuania unexpectedly found a new source of strength in the surrounding Russian territory. The adjoining district of Polock had severed itself earlier than the other Russian principalities from the control of Kiev. Since there also, as formerly in the Russia of the twelfth century, several petty principalities sprang

The Pagans'
Tribute to
Christianity

more so as the prince, although still a pagan, was not disinclined towards the Christian religion, which was introduced there from Russia.

The result was the formation of two parties in Lithuania. The one represented the national element, and defended the national language, customs, and religion; the Christian, which was already the stronger party, inclined toward Russia. At the head of the latter party stood Mendog's son Voj-schelk, an enterprising character, who was devoted to the Greek Church with the full zeal of his fiery soul. He entered a convent, and his dearest wish was to end his days on Mount Athos, as many sovereigns of Oriental Christendom had done. But what Mendog wished was some relaxation in the struggle against the

Livonian and Teutonic Orders; instead of which both parties launched him into a still more obstinate war with the Orders, and, in addition, with Russia. Red Russia now entered on the scene against Lithuania with all its forces; a better understanding between it and the Teutonic knights had been effected. Both sides fought for the possession of Black Russia. If the princes of Halicz had succeeded in uniting Black Russia with their possessions, a new power, with the Little Russians for its chief supporters, would have been formed, owing to the internal dissensions of Lithuania and the disintegration with which Russia was threatened from the south-east through the Tartar ascendancy.

But the wily Lithuanian understood how to cripple all his foes. He first professed his willingness to accept Christianity. Innocent IV. sent him the royal crown, and Mendog received it and the rite of baptism at Novgorod, in 1250. In this way a friendly understanding was promoted between him and the Livonian Order. By ceding to the latter the whole region of Smud, he revenged himself also on that national party which refused to recognise his overlordship.

Mendog also concluded a treaty with the Prince of Red Russia in 1255, and ceded Black Russia to him as a fief. His son Vojschelk married a daughter of the prince of the former. The people soon rose in Smud against the Livonian Order, and were willing now to accept Mendog's rule. Mendog vigorously

supported this movement; the Order suffered a decisive defeat, and was compelled once more to cede all the Lithuanian provinces. In this way the power of the Grand Duke in Lithuania was strengthened. For although Mendog was murdered in 1263, others aimed at the position of Grand Duke. Lithuania had now, therefore, to face the same struggle for the constitution as Russia, Poland, and other Slavonic countries.

The family of Mendog had made a power out of Lithuania; but it was the lot of another Lithuanian family to raise Lithuania into a great power—the family, that is, whose representative, Gedymis, was Grand Duke in 1316. The state of Lithuania had already acquired a quite different aspect. Its swamps and lakes were not its only fortifications, but the country was covered with castles and walled towns. An improved method of warfare had been learnt from the Germans. Russian culture permeated public and private life; the Russian language was the language of the



A PILGRIMAGE SCENE AT THE CHAPEL OF OSTRO BRAMA IN WILNA

Church, the court, and the nobility; the princely chancery used no language except Russian; the Lithuanian army consisted to a large extent of Russian troops, and was often led by Russians.

As a sort of Russian state, Lithuania was able to expand more easily on Russian territory. Gedymis had several Russian principalities. His rule was actually greeted with joy in the regions occupied by the Tartars.



THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CATHEDRAL OF WILNA



GENERAL VIEW SHOWING THE BRIDGE OF ZARECHIE



PALACE OF WERKI, THE SEAT OF THE RUSSIAN GOVERNOR
VIEWS IN WILNA, THE ANCIENT CAPITAL OF LITHUANIA

The Lithuanians defeated even the dreaded Mongols, who were reckoned invincible. Kiev itself oscillated now between the Lithuanian and the Tartar ruler. Russian districts composed with it the predominant part of the Lithuanian state, which, under Gedymin, was the first power of Eastern Europe. Although still

The Founding of Lithuania's Capital City a pagan, Gedymin married Russian princesses, and allowed them to live according to the Christian faith and

educate their children in it. He married his son Olgerd to a princess of Witebsk, his second son to a princess of Volhynia; one daughter to Prince Symeon of Moscow, and another to the Prince of Tver. Aldona wedded Casimir of Poland; the fourth daughter, Boleslav Trojdenovicz of Masovia. He sent colonists into the wide deserts, and built towns and villages, to which he gave privileges of the German type.

He founded Wilna, the future capital of Lithuania, transferred the pagan sanctuary thither in 1322, and had the sacred fire kindled there before the altar of Perkunas. At the same time he entered into negotiations with the Pope, obviously only to hold the Teutonic Order in check. In 1336 the Grand Master Dietrich of Altenburg (1335-1341) once more organised a great "journey" to Lithuania. The knights marched on Smud; and Pillene, where some four thousand Lithuanians, with their wives and children, were shut in, was besieged. Fire decided the fate of the wooden fortress and its valiant defenders.

Gedymin met his death in 1340 or 1341, at the fortress of Welona when it was besieged by the Germans, having been struck by a cannon-ball; use was therefore made of the invention of gunpowder earlier than at Crecy in 1346. Following the precedent of Russia, Gedymin had legalised the dignity of Grand Duke, and attached it to the possession of Wilna.

Pagan Burial for a Christian Leader Javnut was marked out to be Grand Duke. His other six sons—Monvid, Narymunt, Koriat, Olgerd,

Kejstut and Lubart—divided the rest of the kingdom between them. Olgerd and Kejstut stood out conspicuously among them. The former obtained Lithuania proper, with Krevo and the territory of Witebsk; Kejstut, on the other hand, obtained Smud, with Troki as capital, Grodno, and Berestie in Black Russia.

Olgerd was a strong and handsome man, of fine intellect and political insight, and, what was rare in his days, sober and abstemious. He understood several languages, and was not addicted to play. A crafty leader, he did not even inform his troops on the march to what goal he was leading them. Olgerd was the representative of the Christian party among the Russians. His wives and children were Christians. According to Russian authorities he was a Christian himself, although the foreign chroniclers assert that his corpse was burnt on a funeral pyre; perhaps the pagan priests wished this to be so.

Kejstut, an honest nature, a typical knight in every sense, and an impetuous spirit, was deified by the people as the representative of the national paganism. He unselfishly helped his brother to obtain the grand-ducal power, and was his most loyal subject, friend and guardian. Himself a pagan by honest conviction, he was the last Lithuanian prince who was buried according to heathen customs. Both added to the greatness and fame of Lithuania. While Olgerd as Grand Duke united Russian principalities with Lithuania, conquered Kiev itself, and so advanced the frontiers as far south as the Tartar tribes of the Black Sea and eastward beyond the Dnieper, Kejstut took over the protection of the western frontier and the war with the combined knightly Orders.

The chroniclers record many noble features in the life of this great hero. Kejstut rescued by his intercession the commandant of a castle of the Order who was sentenced by the Lithuanians to be burnt; he also forcibly expressed his displeasure when corpses were wantonly mutilated on the battlefield. If he planned an attack into the knights' country he used to announce his intention to their commanders, and he naturally expected similar chivalrous treatment from the Order. When Covno was suddenly attacked by the knights in 1362, he lodged a protest against such conduct before the far-famed Grand Master Winrich von Kniprode (1351-1382). On one occasion, being made prisoner and brought to Marienburg, he was recognised and secretly liberated by Alf, the servant assigned to him, a Lithuanian by birth. Kejstut was almost beloved by the Order on account of his chivalrous spirit. Once,

LITHUANIA TO THE UNION WITH POLAND

when, after the unsuccessful siege of a castle, he was compelled to cross a river and was nearly drowned, the marshal Henning Schindekopf drew him out of the water and refused to make him prisoner.

For forty years Kejstut unweariedly defended Lithuania, by the people of which he was extolled as their first national hero. The Order was not able to make any conquests there in his time. In spite of his support of paganism, Christianity itself continued to make greater and greater progress in Kejstut's dominions, although there were naturally many martyrs. Roman Catholicism alone could strike no root there. Both the Dominican and Franciscan monasteries, which had existed in Wilna under Gedymin, were suspended under Olgerd. When, then, they were revived by the Boyar Gastold, who went over to Catholicism to please his wife, a band of pagans attacked Gastold's house and killed seven monks; the others were crucified and thrown into the river.

Lithuania in its victorious career was bound sooner or later to come into contact with Moscow and the Tartars; both, indeed, aimed at the same goal—the union of Russia in their hands. If Olgerd beat the Tartars, his success could find only a joyful response in the hearts of the Russians. It was therefore easy for him to subjugate one Russian district after another. There was no fundamental distinction between Russia and Lithuania under Olgerd's régime. Only in Moscow existed any dangerous rival to the Lithuanian princes. Olgerd was able to postpone the decisive blow. He died, however, in 1377.

After Olgerd, Kejstut, as the senior of the family, ought to have mounted the grand ducal throne; but in accordance with a wish of his brother, he renounced his claim in favour of his nephew Jagiello. The latter was of a different disposition from his father, Olgerd. He dragged on a dull existence without lofty aspirations. Contrary to precedent, Jagiello allied himself with the Tartars, nominally in order to confront Moscow with their help. He then, by an equally gross breach with the traditions of his house, made secret overtures to the Teutonic Order. He was assisted in this by one of his crown councillors named Vojdylo, whom Kejstut

had offended on some occasion. Jagiello did not concern himself about the repeated attacks of the knights; in fact, he concluded with the Order a secret treaty which was aimed at Kejstut.

Kejstut, greatly annoyed, surprised Wilna, took his nephew prisoner, and discovered the original text of the treaty with the Order. He then mounted the grand ducal throne himself, gave Witebsk and Krevo to Jagiello, and then set him completely at liberty, with no other condition than that he should hang the traitor Vojdylo. Then a second relation, Dmitri Korybut, rose against Kejstut. Jagiello brought up his forces, nominally to the aid of Kejstut, but led them against Wilna and took it. The knights of the Order, who were allied with Jagiello, soon advanced. Troki, Kejstut's residence, was taken and sacked. Kejstut quickly collected forces to save his castles. Jagiello then implored Kejstut's son Witold, a friend of his, to intervene, since he did not wish to shed blood. Kejstut and Witold went, on the guarantee of a third person, into the camp of Jagiello, and were then thrown into chains. Cast into a gloomy dungeon at Krevo, Kejstut was found strangled there on the fifth day, in 1382. His body was burnt according to pagan rites.

Witold, who had made good his escape, went to Masovia and thence to the territory of the Order. Baptised according to Catholic rites, he took the name of his sponsor, Wigand, commander of Ragnit, 1383. The Order, to which Witold-Wigand promised to cede Saimaiten, north of the river Memel, in the event of his having no issue, welcomed the new ally. But in the latter the old, and therefore more intense, hatred for the Teutonic knights quickly overpowered his momentary thirst for vengeance. He had barely concluded the treaty with the Order when he sought and obtained a reconciliation with Jagiello. The most salient feature of Witold's character was a pronounced sympathy with Lithuania. If he could not reach the desired goal by the straight road, he did not, on occasion, hesitate at dubious methods. Here, however, the separate history of Lithuania closes. In 1386 Jagiello was baptised, and wedded Hedwig of Poland. The union of the crowns merges Lithuania into Poland.



HISTORICAL MAPS OF POLAND AND WESTERN RUSSIA FROM THE YEAR 1300 TILL 1660



UNION OF LITHUANIA WITH POLAND

STAGES IN THE NATION'S DEVELOPMENT

WHEN King Lewis I. of Hungary and Poland died at Tyrnau, on September 11th, 1382, according to the tenor of the treaty of Kashau, concluded in 1374, one of his daughters was to obtain the Polish crown. He had three daughters—Catharine, Maria, and Hedwig. Catharine was originally intended for Poland, Maria was wedded to Sigismund, Margrave of Brandenburg, and Hedwig was betrothed to Duke William of Austria. When Catharine had predeceased her father, the Polish succession was proposed for Maria. But this was hardly acceptable for Poland. Since Poland had been greatly neglected by Lewis, it wished to acknowledge only that one of his daughters who would pledge herself to reside with her husband in the country. Sigismund, the prospective king of Hungary, could not possibly consent to such an arrangement. Casimir the Great had

Candidates for the Polish Crown wished first to strengthen his country economically, in order to be able to show a bolder front against the Teutonic Order—the most dangerous of Poland's foes, since it was supported by all Western Europe; with this object he had concluded a series of treaties with his neighbours. When he concluded the succession treaty with his nephew Lewis of Hungary, the latter had to give a pledge that he would reconquer the lost provinces of Poland with his own forces. From whom? Obviously only from the Order. But Lewis had procrastinated; the Polish atmosphere did not please him. The Order thus increased, and with it the German element. As a result of this, the national feeling and the hatred of the Germans grew so strong, both in Poland and Lithuania, that any candidate would have been more acceptable to the Poles and Lithuanians than the Margrave of Brandenburg. The Polish statesmen were aware that if Sigismund obtained the crown of Poland this would involve the

loss of its independence. When, even in the lifetime of his father-in-law, he had come to Poland at the head of a small army in order to receive homage, his entry into Cracow was barred; only the towns, where the German element predominated, received him cordially. Sigismund was compelled, therefore, to leave Poland without having achieved his purpose. And so the matter rested, since he could not obtain any firm footing at first even in Hungary.

The Polish throne was thus once more regarded as vacant. Prince Ziemko of Masovia soon came forward, supported by a large party and the Archbishop Bodzanta of Gnesen, who actually proclaimed him king when the envoys of the queen mother Elizabeth—who died in 1387—appeared, with the declaration that Hedwig, who was born in 1369, and who was destined for the Polish throne, would soon come to Cracow for coronation. But after vainly waiting a long time for Hedwig, the Poles began to lose patience. The matter was not so simple. In the first place, the queen widow was herself in danger. Next, Hedwig, although just thirteen years old, was betrothed to William of Austria, whom the Poles could never accept, and who would not consent to give up Hedwig. Only after a declaration that the claims of Hedwig on the Polish crown would be regarded as waived if she did not appear within two months in Poland, did Elizabeth resolve to send her daughter to Poland. Hedwig, now a child of barely fifteen years, came to Cracow at the beginning of October, 1384, accompanied by the Archbishop of Gran and the Bishop of Csanad, and was crowned on October 15th. The first important step taken by the Polish statesmen had succeeded. The question now remained to find a suitable husband for the young queen.

Sigismund's Thwarted Purpose

A Girl of Fifteen on the Throne

National and religious considerations led the Poles to Lithuania. Poland as well as Lithuania fought against the Teutonic Order as their common and deadly enemy. Only by combined efforts could they hope to crush it. At the same time the thought of a union was not new. Vladislav Lokietok, when pressed hard

Lithuania in the Grip of Germans by the Knights, had married his son Casimir to Aldona, a daughter of Gedymin. The idea then still prevailed that

even single-handed they were a match for the Germans. But Lithuania was now torn by party feuds. New and stronger German castles arose on its soil and gripped it with iron arms. Another circumstance also favoured the rapprochement. Lithuania had been zealously addicted to paganism, but the number of the Christians now increased continually. Kejstut, the last pagan on the throne, was now dead. Lithuania was thus, from political and religious reasons, ripe for a union with Poland, and it is easy for two nations to form a sincere alliance when a great danger threatens both.

We do not know from which side the suggestion came. But since the prospect of missionary work on a large scale in Lithuania and the whole East was thus opened up to the Catholic Church of Poland, and since Kmita, the provincial of the Franciscan Order, was a trusted friend of Jagiello, we may suppose that apart from the nobility of Little Poland, who turned the scale and zealously advocated the union of the two states—the Franciscans chiefly prepared the ground in Lithuania. The view that paganism could nowhere be tolerated was then very strong in Europe; the Order owed to it the friendship of Western Europe. But if this pretext, which furnished its chief source of strength in the struggle against Lithuania, were to be cut away, Lithuania must inevitably accept Christianity. Then

The Wooing of Poland's Young Queen only could the power of the Roman Church, which was still the decisive force in Europe, be made useful. The

fact that Jagiello with his whole people resolved to accept Christianity shows that, in spite of his low moral character, he was a far-sighted statesman, with a clear notion of diplomacy.

In the early days of the year 1385 a Lithuanian embassy to Cracow formally asked Hedwig's hand for their prince

Jagiello. No decision could be made without consulting Hedwig's mother; and messengers were, therefore, sent to Elizabeth. The dislike felt by the Magyars for Sigismund and William caused a decision in favour of Jagiello. It was certainly withdrawn again, and William himself appeared in Cracow, where romantic love passages took place between him and the young queen. But any opposition was wrecked on the firmness of the Polish grandees.

On February 12th, 1386, Jagiello made his entry into Cracow after he had accepted all the conditions proposed. He promised to throw himself into the bosom of the Catholic Church with all his still unbaptised brothers and relations, all the nobles, and all the inhabitants of his country, rich or poor, and to devote his treasures to the use of both kingdoms. Further, he promised to pay Duke William of Austria the forfeit of 200,000 gulden, which was entailed by the repudiation of the marriage contract, to make good at his own cost all the encroachments and curtailments to which the Polish Empire had been subjected, to

A Series of Royal Marriages release all Polish prisoners of both sexes, and to unite for ever his Lithuanian and Russian dominions with the Polish

crown. Everything now depended on Hedwig. It was plainly put to her that she would not only serve her own country, but would perform a meritorious action in the sight of God, if a whole region was won for Christianity through her instrumentality. Besides this, the news from Hungary must have forced Hedwig to come to a determination, where the royal power was grievously imperilled, and her mother's life in danger. On February 15th, Jagiello was baptised, together with those of his brothers and kinsmen who were present. The office of sponsor, which had been declined by the Grand Master Conrad of Rotenstein (1382-1390), fell to Vladislav of Oppeln, whence Jagiello received in baptism the name of Vladislav II. Then followed the marriage and the coronation, on March 4th, 1386. After that, Wigand, the king's brother, married the daughter of Vladislav of Oppeln, Prince Janusz of Ratibor married Helene, niece of the king, and Prince Ziemko of Masovia the king's sister, Alexandra. Vladislav II., Jagiello of Lithuania, was not at first hereditary monarch of Poland, but merely

UNION OF LITHUANIA WITH POLAND

prince consort and regent of the empire. The name of his dynasty is perhaps more familiar in the form Jagellon.

There is no more important event in the history of the Polish people, with the exception of the conversion to Christianity, than the union of Lithuania with Poland, which was completed in the year 1386. It gave a quite different aspect to the Eastern question, and completely changed

the course of his ory. Poland, itself too small to play any part in the midst of powerful neighbours, had first leaned upon Hungary. But that policy had not proved to her advantage; Polish interests, especially as against the Order, had been neglected, whereas Poland and Lithuania had now hardly anything more to fear from the Teutonic Knights. Indeed, the Order, when dealing with a Christianised Lithuania, lost its *raison d'être*. Soon not merely the emperor, but the Pope, declared publicly that the Order had now fulfilled its task. Later Popes forbade the expeditions

among the heathen and any injury to Lithuania; a century had hardly elapsed after the baptism of Jagiello when it was proposed that the Knights should be transplanted to Podolia, and be employed in the war against the Turks and Tartars. Besides this, the position of Poland in the new treaty with Lithuania was far more favourable than had been the case in the treaty with Hungary. Poland, as a result of these changes, now stood higher

in every respect than Lithuania. Further, Jagiello, a thoroughly selfish character, had, in return for the crown of Poland, formally given up his country to the Poles. Poland was the recipient, Lithuania the donor, if we disregard the free constitution, the new religion, and the culture which the Poles had to give to the Lithuanians. Henceforward the will of the Polish king was all important in

Lithuania, or rather, since he himself was of little consequence, the will of the Polish nobles and the Catholic priesthood. Lithuania, three times as large as Poland, sank into an appanage of the Polish crown. Hitherto there had been in Eastern Europe three political centres, Poland, Lithuania, and Russia, not to speak of the Tartars, but now the largest of them, Lithuania, suddenly ceased to exist. Henceforward only Poland and Russia confronted each other, and the time was approaching when the question would be decided which of the two was to dominate Eastern Europe.



VLADISLAV III. THE BOY KING OF HUNGARY & POLAND

Brief, but stirring, was the reign of this youthful monarch. He was barely fifteen years of age when, in 1440, a Hungarian embassy arriving in Poland, offered him the throne of his late father, Vladislav II. Fighting against the Turks, the young king fell at Varna in 1444.

When the first frosts came in the winter of 1386-1387, Jagiello, accompanied by princes and grandees, and by numerous priests and Franciscan monks as spiritual leaders of the undertaking, marched to his home in order, according to his promise, to baptise his subjects. At the beginning of January, 1387, when the ice built firm bridges everywhere in that country of rivers, lakes, and marshes, the Polish mission appeared at Wilna. It was just

after the long autumn festivities, a time when the supplies of the Lithuanians began to fail. The missionaries, however, brought a quantity of corn, new white linen robes, and other presents for those about to be baptised, and appeared in state just as Otto, the apostle of Pomerania, had formerly done. The will of the prince

The Dawn of a New Era had still more weight in Lithuania. Besides this, Vladislav Jagiello, in order to win over the nobles, conferred on all Catholic Boyars, as from February 20th, 1387, the "Polish right"—that is, all the liberties which the Polish nobility possessed.

This was the first charter of Lithuania. Concurrently, the Catholic Church was organised by the creation and splendid endowment of a bishopric at Wilna, with seven parish churches at Miednicki, Meszagole, Wilkomierz, Krevo, Niemerczyn, Hajnovo, and Obolcza. The first bishop was the Franciscan Vasylo, a Pole, formerly confessor of Queen Elizabeth, and then Bishop of Sereth. The wooden image of the god Perkunas stood on the highest summit of the town of Wilna. The flames of the unapproachable Znicz still darted forth on the oak-planted square as the missionary procession came up the hill, singing holy songs. The sacred oaks were felled, the "eternal" fire was quenched. A thundering Te Deum announced to the people the dawn of a new era. Not a hand was raised to protect the old gods. Men and women were then led to the river, and whole companies received a Christian name—one to each batch. Distinguished Boyars had the honour of separate baptism.

The same ceremony was performed in the surrounding country. The number of those who were then baptised is put at 30,000. By the end of July, 1387, Jagiello was again in Cracow, and informed the Pope that Lithuania was converted. "Among all kings of the world

Lithuania Adopts Christianity thou, dear son, holdest the first place in our heart," answered Urban VI., whose sternness in 1378 caused the great schism.

But when he further said, "Rejoice, my son, that thou hast been found again like a hidden treasure and hast escaped destruction," these words, transferred to the political world, aptly represented the true state of affairs. Even in Germany there was a prophecy that all states would disappear except Poland and Lithuania.

Various petty states of Eastern Europe now sought support from the newly created empire of Poland-Lithuania; Hungary, for example, was just then crippled by internal disturbances. Soon after the coronation the petty princes of North Russia, mostly vassals of Lithuania, began to do homage to the now powerful Grand Duke. While Vladislav Jagiello still remained in Lithuania, Hedwig personally received the homage of Red Russia, which, since the times of Casimir the Great, belonged half to the Hungarian, half to the Polish crown, but had received from Lewis the Great a Magyar Starost-General. In Lemberg the brothers Peter and Roman who, as voivodes of Moldavia, were, properly speaking, Hungarian vassals, did homage to the Lithuanian; the Metropolitan Cyprian of Kiev read out the formula of the oath according to the orthodox rites. In the year 1390, a second Hungarian vassal, Prince Mircea the Elder of Wallachia, did homage. In the course of the next years the voivodes of Bessarabia and Transylvania did the same, and their successors renewed this oath. In the north

The New Empire's Wide Power the fear of the German-Livonian Order and of Moscow, in the south the fear of the Turks, drove those small princes to seek refuge under the great ruler. The sphere of the influence of Poland-Lithuania expanded now from sea to sea.

Meanwhile, the Teutonic Order had acquired more and more territory by purchase and treaty. It roused up opposition against Vladislav Jagiello at Rome and at every European court. The situation became especially grave, since in every negotiation it constantly invoked the intervention of the empire, and required actual obedience from Lithuanian princes. Vladislav of Oppeln submitted to the Grand Master of Wallenrod himself (1391-1393) a scheme for the partition of Poland. Poland-Lithuania was, however, not free from blame. In dire straits treaties were made with the Knights, and some territory was actually ceded; but there was bitter feeling against every arbitrator who assigned the land in question to the Germans. There was no rupture to be feared in the lifetime of Hedwig, whose father, Lewis, had been a patron of the Order. But after her death, in 1399, the decision could not long be postponed. Witold, Jagiello's cousin, was especially eager for war.

UNION OF LITHUANIA WITH POLAND

In the year 1410, Germany had three kings or emperors, Wenzel, Jost, and Sigismund, and would therefore bring no help to the Order. Lithuania enlisted Bohemian mercenaries and secured the aid of the Tartars. Witold incited the Samaiten country to revolt, although he had previously given 150 hostages to the Order. There was nothing left for these poor wretches except to hang themselves on the doors of their prisons. The Russian vassals of Lithuania marched also to their assistance. Nevertheless, the operations were by no means easy.

and Zbigniew Olesnicki, later Bishop of Cracow and first statesman of Poland, took part in the battle. Contemporaries probably realised the far-reaching effects of this event more than the writers of the present day; John Dlugosz, soon after 1457, urged that the spoils should be kept for ever in the Church, and that the anniversary should be commemorated in perpetuity.

The Order, it is true, tried its fortune repeatedly afterwards, but always without success. If Vladislav II. Jagiello had been a true soldier he could easily have



ARMED POLISH NOBLEMAN AND A "HAIDUK" OF THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The Teutonic Order, then the only power in Europe which could mobilise its forces in a fortnight, had splendid artillery, excellent cavalry, and a large body of mercenaries at its disposal. In culture it stood on a distinctly higher level than Poland.

The Grand Master Ulrich von Jungingen anticipated Poland with a declaration of war. The first engagement took place in the territory of the Order at Grünwald and Tannenberg, on July 15th, 1410; the army of the Order was annihilated. The Polish army for the first time sang the *Te Deum* in the Polish language. The chief credit of the victory belongs to Witold. Dlugosz, father of the celebrated historian,

made himself master of Marienburg, for treachery was rife. Many of the Knights collected their money and goods and fled to Germany. The writer who completed the "*Chronicle of the Land of Prussia*," which had been commenced by Johann von Posilge, an official of Riesenbourg, deceased in 1405, laments the fact. In spite of the comparatively favourable treaty of Thorn on February 1st, 1411, the fall of the Teutonic Order was inevitable. The Electoral College recommended the protection of the Order to the Emperor Sigismund, and Charles VI. of France issued a warning to Poland; but such steps were of little avail.

With the collapse of the power of the Order, the influence of Germany, both national and political on Eastern Europe was broken. The empire lost its magic charm there, while Poland became a great European power; the Hussite movement, for example, became possible only after 1410. The Slavonic

An Age of Intellectual Progress

spirit grew so strong that even German culture could not hold its own. The effect of the year 1386, enhanced by the year 1410, thus signifies an important crisis for the Western and Northern Slavs, whose subjugation would certainly otherwise have been accomplished, as well as a revival of the Slavonic movement.

Vladislav II. Jagiello and Hedwig had done great services in raising the level of Polish civilisation. Hedwig first endowed a college at the University of Prague for such Lithuanians as studied theology there, and then obtained permission from Pope Boniface IX. to found a theological faculty in Cracow. Finally she left her fortune to the University of Cracow, so that in the year 1400 it was able to leave the hamlet of Bawol, near Cracow, and settle in its own buildings in the city. The king himself and the highest officials registered their names as the first among 200 students. Peter Wysz began with lectures in the presence of the king. After 1410 it was possible to equip the university still better, and it soon flourished. Nicholas Copernicus studied theology, medicine, mathematics and astronomy there in 1491. Schools were provided, churches built, art studied.

The Pomeranian duke Boguslav, formerly an ally of the Order, now did homage to the Polish king. Duke Ernest the Iron of Styria, Carinthia and Carniola, a brother of that William who met with such humiliating treatment in 1385, went to Cracow in 1412, concluded a defensive and offensive alliance with Poland,

and married a niece of the king, the daughter of Ziemko of Masovia, Cimburbis, or Cecilia, who

created a sensation by her physical strength, her beauty, and her "large lips." She became in 1415 the mother of Emperor Frederic III., and thus—after the hereditary Countess Johanna von Pfirdt, who died in 1351—the second great ancestress of the house of Hapsburg, at the same time she attained a similarly high dignity in

house of Wettin, since her daughter the Margaretha, who died in 1486, was married to the elector Frederic II. the Clement. The Emperor Sigismund himself, who even before Tannenberg had invaded the Cracovian territory, concluded a truce with Poland, and from November 8th, 1412, pledged the thirteen towns of the Zips district to Vladislav Jagiello. In fact, just when the Hussite movement was at its height, embassies appeared several times in Cracow to offer the crown of Bohemia also to the Polish king.

But this scheme, like the further progress of Poland, was wrecked on the personality of the king. Vladislav II. Jagiello, uneducated and sensual, without energy and deficient in military ability, was not the man who might have served a great empire, burdened with a difficult constitution in critical times, although from his position as Grand Duke of Lithuania he was invaluable as a visible sign of the union, and was clever enough to adapt himself to the new situation. He was, besides, too indifferent in most matters. His nobles, especially the bishops, man-

aged everything. Nevertheless, a certain progress is observable in him if we picture to ourselves how he once had governed

despotically as a pagan; while he now had to rule a Catholic people within almost constitutional limits. Transplanted to another soil, his disposition underwent a change; from a rude barbarian he became a soft-hearted and absolutely effeminate character. He towered above the princes of Moscow, for example, in culture. Illuminated by the glory of a great victory, and as the suzerain of many princes, he loved to appear in magnificent state, like his brother-in-law Sigismund, for whom he always showed a certain weakness. He rode with a suite of 100 knights and an escort of 6,000 or 8,000 horse. He was so generous that the story ran in the territory of the Order that he had won the Polish crown by bribery, and his successors completely squandered the crown lands. Vladislav Jagiello was four times married. After the death of Hedwig in 1399 he married the daughter of the Count of Cilli, a granddaughter of Casimir the Great and sister of that Barbara who, having married, as her second husband, Sigismund in 1408, died as empress widow in 1451; next, Elizabeth Granovska; and, finally, in 1422, he

UNION OF LITHUANIA WITH POLAND

espoused, through the mediation of Witold, the Russian princess Sofie Olfzanska of Kiev, who died in 1461. He died on May 31st, 1434, at Grodek, having almost attained the age of eighty-six years.

His successors, called after him Jagellons, ruled in Poland until 1572 as elective, not hereditary, kings. In the fifteenth century Poland reached the highest point in her political history, while in the sixteenth her civilisation was at its zenith.

Some years after the death of Vladislav II. Jagiello, who had left two sons, Vladislav (III.) and Casimir IV. (Andreas), a Hungarian embassy appeared in Poland in 1440, which offered the crown of St. Stefan to Vladislav III., a boy of barely fifteen years. Fear of the Turks had caused this recourse to powerful Poland. This time not merely the notables of the national party, but also the bishops, even Olesnicki of Cracow, the all-powerful leader of Polish policy, counselled acceptance of the offer. It was worth the struggle against the unbelievers. Poland also had interests in the south. This led, therefore, to the first war against the Otto-

Young King Falls Fighting the Ottomans mans. The young king fell at Varna on November 10th, 1444. The Hungarians had, it is true, chosen Matthias Corvinus king in 1458, and the Bohemians, George of Podiebrad. But after the death of the two, the Bohemians first, and then the Hungarians, by the choice of Vladimir (II.), a son of Casimir, fell back upon the house of the Jagellons. This family retained the crowns of Poland, Hungary, and Bohemia until 1526, when Lewis, son of Vladislav II., fell as the last of the Bohemian-Hungarian branch at Mohacs.

More important for the Polish Empire than the acquisition of the crowns of Bohemia and Hungary was the victorious advance to the Baltic. The Teutonic Knights had often tried after 1410 to retrieve their losses. Poland was compelled to wage a tedious war against them during the years 1420-1430; the campaign flagged greatly. But the dissolution of the Order could not be staved off. The estates of the country, dissatisfied with the rule of the Knights, took up a hostile attitude; the "Lizard League" founded in 1397, and the Prussian League of 1440, were openly and secretly aimed against the Order. Men once more took courage and tried to effect a rupture.

After the Emperor Frederic III. in 1453 had issued the command that the league was to be dissolved, the latter resolved to submit to the Polish king, Casimir IV. Andreas. In February, 1454, twelve members of the league appeared in Cracow and offered the Polish king the possession of Prussia. Cardinal Olesnicki tried to dissuade him. But Casimir **Polish King in Possession of Prussia** accepted it without hesitation, and immediately nominated the spokesman of the Knights of the Lizard, Hans von Baisen, to be governor, awarded to the Prussian estates the rights of salvage, etc., and freed the towns from the harbour dues known as poundage. The Order, defeated and actually driven out of Marienburg, was forced to accept on October 19th, 1466, the unpalatable second treaty of Thorn.

The whole of Western Prussia, with Marienburg, Thorn, Danzig, Elbing, and Kulm, fell to Poland, and Ludwig von Ehrlichshausen (1449-1469) was compelled to take the oath of fealty to the King of Poland for East Prussia. Every Grand Master, six months after election, was to swear the oath of loyalty to the king for himself and his followers. The Master was to recognise no superior—Poland excepted—but the Pope, and to conclude no alliances or treaties without the sanction of the king. Prussia and Poland were to remain united for ever. Immediately afterwards "suitable persons" from the subjects of the Polish kingdom were added to the Prussian houses of the Teutonic Order, on condition that they should not compose more than half the members of the Order, but should be also eligible to half its offices. The Grand Master further could not be deprived of his office without the king's knowledge. A long chapter in Polish history was thus closed. "With reluctance I saw," said Dlugosz, "how Polish territory hitherto was divided among different nations, and I count myself and my contemporaries happy in having been allowed to live to see this territory won back again."

Poland's Lost Territory Won Back

Poland thus obtained a large town population, of which she had long and deeply felt the want. The possession of the mouth of the Vistula and a firm foothold on the Baltic Sea was of inestimable value to Poland, although she did not make full use of it for the development of her trade, or succeed in making the townsfolk Polish.



THE WEDDING TOILET OF A YOUNG LADY OF THE BOYARS
From the painting by A. G. Makovsky



THE NEW DOMINION OF POLAND LITHUANIA'S PLACE IN THE DUAL MONARCHY

MORE important for Poland than its foreign relations was the internal development—that is, the development of the constitution in the young dual monarchy and the other relations between Poland and Lithuania. The chief task was to secure for all future time the union which had early been accompanied by such great successes. The solution of this and many other problems devolved upon Poland.

There could be no doubt as to the foundation on which the constitution was to be based. The Catholic religion was certainly the standard by which all reforms must be tested. This fundamental idea had already been expressed in the document of February 20th, 1387, in which the Polish rights were only granted to Catholic Lithuanians; a special article went so far as to assert that any man who left the Catholic faith should *ipso facto* lose all privileges. In order that the Church might grow in the future, marriage between the Roman Catholic Lithuanians and members of the Greek Orthodox faith was forbidden; if, however, the parties had secretly married, the Greek party was to be compelled to accept conversion. The non-Catholic population was excluded, therefore, from all privileges.

But this policy of depressing the non-Catholic population, intelligible and wise as it was in itself, provoked bitterness in the Lithuanian and Russian districts and commotions in the adjoining states. When Jagiello was in Cracow in 1386 he had, in order to secure Lithuania, transferred the grand ducal office to his brother Skirgello. One danger threatened, however: his cousin Witold, who had only obtained Grodno, seemed eminently dissatisfied with the new turn of events. He entered into secret connections not only with the Order, but also with the Grand Duke Vassilij Dmitrijevitich of Moscow, and was a suitor for the hand of his sister Sophia.

The cousin brought his Russian bride home in the face of the express prohibition of the king.

An alliance of Lithuania with Moscow influenced for the first time Polish and Lithuanian relations. The distinction between the Roman and the Greek faith became the more noticeable, since Lithuania definitely inclined toward the side of the latter. Witold wished to take the opportunity of his marriage to surprise Wilna. Jagiello, who suspected even his brother, who belonged to the Greek faith, thought it best to win over Witold to his plans. The latter happened to be in the territory of the Order when Bishop Henry of Plock came to him on a secret mission from Jagiello. Witold accepted the offer, effected a reconciliation with Jagiello and Hedwig at Ostrov in Volhynia, and received the grand ducal title, while Skirgello was sent to Kiev. From that day Witold remained so loyal, to the Catholic Church at least, that Pope John XXIII. conferred on him later the title of "Vicar of the Church."

The case was different with his loyalty to the Polish crown. The subordinate position which his native land now took as regards Poland, and perhaps also the slight inflicted upon the Orthodox Church, in which he was brought up, must have chagrined a typical Lithuanian like Witold. The great campaign which he prepared against the Tartars throws a peculiar light on his political plans. He fed himself with the thought of bringing the Russian principalities under his supremacy in order finally to make even Poland dependent on Lithuania. But if he wished to subjugate Moscow, which was then growing, the Tartar power must first be crushed. He was defeated, however, on the Vorskla in 1399. His hopes, so far as they had travelled in that direction,

**Schemes and
Schemers in
High Places**

**The Place
of Religion
in the State**

**Great Campaign
Against
the Tartars**

were buried in that reverse. The battle on the Vorskla was therefore momentous not only for Poland and Lithuania, but also for all Eastern Europe. Above all, it placed Lithuania in a lower position towards Poland. The depressed Witold now resolved to tighten the bond with Poland, and hurried to the king at Cracow. Now for the first time the amalgamation of the two countries was seriously carried out. At the beginning of 1401 Witold assembled his Boyars and Russian vassal princes at Wilna; they all pledged themselves to help Poland with all their forces and take measures that, if Witold died, the whole dominions, inherited and acquired, might devolve on Vladislav Jagiello.

Witold renewed his oath of homage, and the other princes followed his lead; Svidrigello alone appended, as the chronicler of the Order relates, "an illegal seal" to the document in order to testify to his reluctance. Immediately afterwards the Polish dignitaries held an assembly on their side at Radom on March 11th, and equally gave the promise that they would support Lithuania, and after the death of Vladislav Jagiello would not elect a king without Witold's knowledge. If a personal union was concluded in 1386, a constitutional union of the two kingdoms was now effected. The advantage lay with Poland; Lithuania was to be independent only during the lifetime of Witold, and would then be incorporated with the crown of Poland.

When the common danger threatening from the Teutonic Order had been dispelled after the great victory of 1410, it seemed as if the union would break up, for Witold believed that he was strong enough single-handed. Since the Polish statesmen had at times almost spared the Order, they might nearly be suspected of

having intentionally wished to keep the necessity of an alliance with Poland continually before the eyes of the Lithuanians. Witold for his part valued Western civilisation too highly not to form a true estimate of its blessings. But if he wished to raise his country to the plane of a European state, it was essential to make his people Catholics. Catholicism had yet another charm for him—it was the religion of chivalry. Witold had

already dubbed several of his men as knights; but now a creation of knights on a large scale was planned.

The Polish and Lithuanian nobles hurried in crowds to Horodlo on the Bug (1413). Each Polish clan adopted a Catholic Lithuanian Boyar, who then received the family name, the arms, and all rights of the members of that Polish family; thus, for example, the palatine of Wilna, Monvid, became a member of the Leliva family, and bore the same arms as Jasko of Tarnow. Witold himself named forty-seven Boyars as the most worthy. The personal union of 1386 and the constitutional union of 1401 were thus followed by the inauguration of brotherhood between the two nations. All earlier enactments were renewed, and the preliminaries of the impending corporation of Lithuania were so far arranged that it was resolved to undertake for administrative purposes a new partition of the Lithuanian territory on the Polish model.

Vladislav II. Jagiello on this occasion increased the fundamental privileges of the nobility by an enactment of great importance for the future. Henceforward all nobles of Poland and Lithuania were to have the right, whenever it was necessary, of holding meetings and parliaments, for the benefit of the realm with the sanction of the king, at Lublin, Parczow, or some other suitable place. By this enactment the Polish parliament, as it is styled in the charter, was legally recognised, and the chief power in the state was placed in the hands of the nobility. While this new parliamentary constitution implied for Poland an enlargement of existing rights, it was something quite new for Lithuania, which had hitherto been governed by an absolute monarch.

The Lithuanians, in return for their adoption of the Catholic religion and the surrender of political independence, received the same liberties and the same constitution as the Poles, whose arms they were permitted to bear as brothers. Their political loss was compensated by their newly acquired influence on the general affairs of the empire. The two other achievements of the Lithuanians, at any rate, proved illusive. The greatest corruption then prevailed in the Roman Catholic Church; the Hussite and the Protestant movements soon disturbed it.



SIXTEENTH CENTURY ARMOUR OF A POLISH CHIEFTAIN

The gorgeous panoply of a military commander of the sixteenth century, the fantastic dress being made of numerous small iron scales or plates and the elaborate ornamentation being of copper work covered with gold. From the Museum of Tsarskoe Seloe.

Nevertheless, Christianity had not yet lost all its strength. But chivalry was waning; it had already become untenable on military, economic, and social grounds, and from the advance of civilisation. Lithuania had only just laboriously introduced what Western Europe had already begun to discard. On the other

Contending Religions in Poland

hand, the constitution of Horodlo is of first-class importance from the standpoint of civilisation and history generally. Its most prominent characteristic is the accentuation of Catholicity. The Polish statesmen tried to solve their main constitutional problem by the example of Western Europe. Did they succeed? The constitutions of the West were equally based on a Catholic foundation; but their success was not menaced by the existence of a non-Catholic element. Poland, on the contrary, had two strong religious parties side by side. That no account was taken of the Greek faith was attributable to the ideas of Western Europe; but a political reason for this was adduced. "Difference of faith produces difference of sympathies." But subsequently friction was produced by this, and rebellions broke out. Moscow, seizing on this weak spot in the armour of Poland, proclaimed herself the protector of the Orthodox faith and brought Poland to the ground. Through this vulnerable point of her constitution Poland fell a victim to the prevailing Roman Catholic ideas.

Witold then once more showed that he towered above the Polish politicians in statesmanship. It was clear to him that the gulf must somehow be bridged; he perceived the constitutional humiliation of the Orthodox population, and found the solution in the idea of ecclesiastical union. Rome, if an oppressed sovereign sought her aid, had formerly stipulated for a complete adoption of the Catholic faith,

Dissensions in the Roman Church

even if some occasional exemptions were promised. But now it was resolved to carry out the unification of the two Churches in such a way that the Orthodox population need only accept the Catholic articles of belief and show obedience to the Pope, but in other respects should retain their Greek ritual. Before the spread of the Hussite movement men would hardly have ventured to lay such terms before the Curia. Witold energetically supported the

prosecution of this plan. It was essential that the Russo-Lithuanian district with Kiev should, in Church matters, be made independent of the Metropolitan at Moscow. In the same year that Huss was burnt at the stake at Constance (1415), Witold convened a synod of the Russo-Lithuanian clergy at Novohorodok in Lithuania, and proclaimed the independence of the Russo-Lithuanian Church with Kiev as its centre. Gregor Camblak, raised to be Metropolitan of Kiev, went in 1418 with eighteen suffragan bishops to Constance, at the command of the Grand Duke, in order to conclude there the union with the Roman Church. On account of the dissensions in the bosom of the Roman Church the negotiations fell through.

But the idea of union remained. Thus, the union concluded at Florence in the reign of Vladislav III. is, properly speaking, the sequel of those efforts. The plan was resumed in the year 1596 under Sigismund III., when a union was agreed upon at Berest; and so again later. But there is a vast difference between the plan of Witold and the later unions. Witold

The Polish Nationality Strengthened

contemplated only a constitutional equalisation of the Russo-Lithuanian and Catholic population, in which connection he, as a statesman, laid no special weight on creeds, and even protected the Jews; while later the only wish was to promote the Roman Catholic Church and the spread of the Polish element.

The second chief characteristic of the Polish constitution of 1413 is the stress laid on nationality. The Piast constitution had taken no account of other races because it had no cause to do so. But when in 1291 the Bohemian king Wenzel II. became King of Poland also, the Polish nobility, following a precedent under Henry II. of Silesia in the year 1239, drew up a charter that the king should confer offices on Poles alone. The same thing occurred when King Lewis of Hungary reigned in Poland, and again at the election of Jagiello. This article of the constitution raised a barrier between the Poles and the other nations, and thus strengthened the consciousness of Polish nationality.

A third peculiar feature of the Polish constitution was its republican spirit. Since in Horodlo it was only said generally that nobles might meet in suitable

THE NEW DOMINION OF POLAND

localities, but was not precisely laid down by whom or how often they were to be summoned and how many might be present, the republican character of the constitution was emphasised. Wherever several nobles met they had, *ipso facto*, the right to decide on affairs of state; this was the source of the later Sejmiki and confederations. The unity of the constitution was destroyed by it. When an attempt was made, in 1540, in the imperial diet, to fix at least the number of their

deputies, the nobility did not even concede that point. Every noble was a deputy by birth and had a share in the imperial government. The anarchy of the falling empire had its origin at Horodlo. Two classes now guided the destinies of Poland—the Catholic priesthood and the nobility. The peasant population and the citizens of the towns had no place by the side of these two. The impoverishment which the privileged orders brought upon the middle class had a most disastrous effect on industry and trade. The peasantry, however, were bound to retrograde in every sense. The two powerful parties were naturally anxious to increase their privileges still more. When Vladislav Jagiello in 1425 wished to secure the succession of his sons, the stipulation was required in return that for the future only men of noble birth should be admitted to spiritual dignities. This stipulation was not granted, because it ran counter to the custom of the Roman Church itself; but henceforward priests from the common people were to be excluded at any rate from the cathedral chapters at Cracow and Gnesen. Jagiello conferred a new favour on the nobility at Jedlno in the year 1430, and in 1433 at Cracow: "We promise and vow that

we will not allow any property-owning Pole to be imprisoned for any crime, or any penalty to be inflicted upon him before he has been assigned to and brought before some court; excepting thieves and criminals caught red-handed, as well as persons who cannot or will not give any security. Nobody shall be deprived of his goods by the king, but only by the sentence of the barons." This was the Polish act of Habeas Corpus. In Lithuania people had long been

discontented with the state of things created by the union with Poland. Chiefly belonging to the Orthodox communion, they felt their religious and political degradation the more keenly, since they were socially and economically prejudiced by it, and their culture must in the long run inevitably be stunted. In fine, it was felt that Lithuania was in an inferior position as regards Poland. This was perceived with the greater bitterness, since before 1386 Lithuania contained three times as much territory as Poland. At first the opposition massed itself round Witold. The Poles won him over. Then he wished to equalise the differences in a constitutional way by the union. But he could not overcome the politically inferior position of Lithuania. In a letter to Vladislav Jagiello he declared



CASIMIR IV: POLAND'S POWERFUL KING
When he ascended the throne of Poland, in 1447, Casimir attempted to curtail the excessive power of the Catholic ecclesiastical princes, and forced the Pope to renounce the exclusive right of nominating these dignitaries. He died in 1492.

that the Emperor Sigismund (Poland's evil genius, in whose power it lay to break up the union) had suggested to him the idea of aiming at the royal crown for Lithuania. Witold, in fact, staked everything upon obtaining his coronation. He had already invited Jagiello and many neighbouring princes to Luck. The imperial embassy, which was to bring him the crown, had reached the Polish frontier when the Poles barred the way. Sigismund



THE CHRISTMAS STAR: A PRETTY POLISH CUSTOM

At the Christmas season the Polish peasants go round the villages, carrying a huge lighted star, symbolising the Star of Bethlehem. Three boys impersonate the three kings of the East, Caspar, Melchior, and Balthazar. They also carry a little puppet-show, in which the drama of the Nativity and other Scripture incidents are performed.



CHRISTMAS IN POLAND THE STORK AS CAROL-SINGER

In commemoration of the legend that tells how the birds and beasts of the field came to worship the Infant Jesus, the young Polish peasants dress up as various creatures, such as the stork and the bear, and go round the houses singing traditional carols. They are paid with gifts of cakes and sausages. The ceremony is practised also during the Carnival

and Jagiello were at Luck, when Witold died unexpectedly (October 27th, 1430). The danger thus disappeared. Witold probably did not aim at a complete severance of Lithuania from Poland or at the status (which Sigismund designed imposing on him) of a vassal of the German emperor, but rather intended to place

Poland's Yoke Presses on Lithuania

Lithuania on an equal footing with Poland, and wished to employ Germany for the purpose. The Polish yoke grew heavier after Witold's death. Thus, for example, Polish garrisons were thrown into Kamienec and other Podolian fortresses without any warning, and Sigismund, the Grand Duke of Lithuania, was forced in the name of Lithuania to waive all claim to Podolia, and actually to surrender the most important fortresses of Volhynia. Nor was that all. The Poles demanded that all fresh acquisitions of territory should be made in the name of the crown of Poland alone. Finally, in all negotiations and treaties with foreign countries Lithuania was almost completely ignored. The malcontents grouped themselves round the person of Svidrigello, and the opposition found support in Moscow. Then war was determined upon in Poland. Svidrigello, defeated in 1435 on the River Svienta, was forced to recognise the suzerainty of Poland. But the opposition was not yet crushed by this defeat, and now the Grand Duke Casimir himself, brother of King Vladislav III., put himself at its head. The union of Florence in 1439, the arrangements of which were promoted by the Polish statesmen (Bishop Olesnicki received for his services a cardinal's hat), could not but make the more bad blood in the Russo-Lithuanian districts, since King Vladislav III. at the suggestion of the cardinal conferred on the united clergy the same rights which the Latin clergy enjoyed. Casimir IV.

Casimir IV. and the Church

Andreas, even after he had become King of Poland in 1447, did not alter his Lithuanian proclivities. On the contrary, he endeavoured to change the constitution, the defects of which he had clearly recognised. His greatest anxiety was due to the excessive power of the Catholic ecclesiastical princes, especially the haughty behaviour of Olesnicki, who, being the real originator of that constitution, tried to overshadow the crown itself.

Casimir, adroitly making full use of the schism which then divided the Roman Church, forced the anti-Pope Felix V. to renounce the exclusive right of nominating the ecclesiastical dignitaries of his empire; henceforward the king had for six years to fill ninety first places. By this plan the election of the chapters became invalid, and only persons acceptable to the king could be nominated to high offices. Casimir IV. also passed the enactment that the prelates as landowners should be liable to military service, by which means the military constitution of Casimir the Great was completed.


The king also planned to break down the excessive power of the nobility. He was at the same time firmly resolved not to allow Lithuania to be overshadowed by Poland; he resided by preference in the former country and surrounded himself with Lithuanians. When we hear what his attitude towards Bohemia and the Hussites was, how in 1449, in his capacity as Grand Duke of Lithuania, he made an alliance with Grand Duke Vasilij Vasiljevitch against common enemies—the second treaty of Lithuania with Moscow, made in the spirit of Witold—how they mutually secured the guardianship of their children and allowed free trading facilities, and how cautious was Casimir in settling the frontier on the side of Moscow, we may fairly suppose that Casimir courted connections with Moscow in order to show a bolder front against the Poles, and then to be able to reform the constitution.

He delayed to confirm the Polish privileges, wished to institute a trial for high treason against the cardinal, surrounded himself with younger men of his own views, and published pamphlets on the necessity of constitutional reform; in fact, he did not shrink from employing the headsman's axe in order to show the great officials that they were not masters of the state. He began by favouring the lesser nobility, in order to pit them against the magnates. This policy led later to the change in the constitution.


There was popular talk in Lithuania of conquering Podolia by force of arms, and the bitterness between Lithuania and Poland soon reached such a pitch that an open revolt of Lithuania threatened in 1456. If Casimir had persevered in his action



GENERAL VIEW OF THE CITY OF WARSAW



MONUMENT TO KING SIGISMUND AND THE MARKET PLACE



THE PALACE OF THE RUSSIAN GOVERNOR

SCENES IN WARSAW, THE ANCIENT CAPITAL OF POLAND

he would certainly have gained his end. But financial straits forced him to concessions. Poland was confronted with a war against the Order. The Slachta, which met at Cerekwica, refused to take the field before their privileges had been confirmed. Casimir himself required money, since he wished to marry Elizabeth,

The King in Financial Difficulties the sister of the Hungarian king, Ladislaus Posthumus; and since according to the laws the country had to furnish the dowry for the queen, the king was forced in 1453 to give way, and at the imperial diet at Piotrkov, in the presence of twelve knights and twelve barons, took the constitutional oath at the hands of the cardinal whom he detested. The regal power was still more restricted by the appointment of four councillors as assessors to the king, without whose consent no ordinance of the king should have the force of law. This first defeat of the crown was followed by others under Casimir's successors.

From the time of Casimir onwards we can notice two currents in the national life of Poland: the majority of the nobles worked for the enlargement of their privileges, while the second party aimed at the strengthening of the royal power and a restriction of personal liberty. This division of aims was to be found in every state of Europe. A contemporary of Casimir was the Florentine Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527), who, in his "Principe," which was addressed to Lorenzo de' Medici in 1514, published a treatise for the guidance of princes, to whom he wished to communicate the art of attaining an unrestricted authority. And at the court of Poland lived a representative of this school, the humanist Filippo Buonaccorsi, better known under the Latin name of Callimachus Experiens, to whom, together with John Dlugosz, Casimir had entrusted the education of his children.

Opposing Forces at Work in Poland But while in many European countries the imperialistic party won the day, the republican party in Poland continuously gained the upper hand.


Casimir's son and successor, John I. Albert (1492-1501) vigorously prosecuted his father's plan, but in the end, like him, had to acknowledge failure. He is said to have planned nothing less than a coup d'état in order to overthrow the nobles and strengthen the monarchical power.

He governed without the senate. When the primate Olesnicki died, John Albert set his brother Frederic on the archiepiscopal throne. He introduced greater magnificence at court and made difficulties, whenever possible, about the admission of the magnates. He concluded a treaty with his brother Vladislav (II.) of Bohemia and Hungary in which they pledged themselves to help each other "in case of any rebellion of their subjects or any attempt by them to restrict the monarchical power."

The most certain means of increasing his power seemed to him to be a victorious war; he proposed to conquer Moldavia for his youngest brother Sigismund. All the Jagellons, with the exception of Alexander of Lithuania, assembled at Leutschau in Hungary in 1494 to discuss that campaign. They had, besides, every cause to join forces, since the Hapsburgs had concluded an alliance with Moscow against Poland. Preparations were made under pretext of a war against the Turks. Then the same situation came about as under Casimir—the nobles would not vote any supplies, and

The Nobility Defeats the Crown Albert saw himself compelled to grant extensive concessions to the nobility at the diet at Piotrkov in 1496. Besides this, he suffered an overwhelming defeat in 1497 at Cozmin in the Bukovina.

The new, and at the same time monstrous feature, of the legislation of John Albert, extorted in 1496 by the Slachta, was that it formally surrendered the peasant population to the nobility. The pressure of the Slachta must have been great indeed when it could be complained in the diet that the country-folk left their fields in crowds and that the villages were empty. On the basis of the enactments of Casimir the Great (who had checked emigration so far that only a peasant who had more than one son should be allowed to send one to school or to business in the town, and then only on a certificate from his lord) it was enacted that henceforward in every year only one peasant might leave his village. This restriction was not modified until 1501. In another article townsfolk were prohibited from acquiring and owning property according to provincial law. Further, the admission of non-nobles into the ecclesiastical hierarchy was restricted. Formerly, indeed, no



A MEMORIAL OF A LOST INDEPENDENCE THE PALACE OF THE KINGS OF POLAND AT WARSAW

non-nobles were admitted to the higher offices in the cathedrals at Gnesen, Cracow, Posen, and Plock, but now the superior posts generally, to the exclusion of foreigners, were reserved for natives of noble birth alone. These two provisions were ostensibly designed to increase the military force. If, according to the tenor of the military system of Casimir the Great, only land-owning nobles were under any obligations of military service, in the interests of public defence the admission of non-nobles to ecclesiastical offices ought to be prevented, and the sale of "noble" property to them forbidden, because they were exempt from military service. Only certain benefices might be conferred upon "plebeians."

The articles concerning workmen were equally harsh: they were forbidden to go to Prussia and Silesia to work at harvest-time, in order that there might be no want of labour in Poland and that the wages might not need to be raised. The destitute were to be employed on the construction of fortresses on the Turkish or Tartar frontiers. The statute of 1496 significantly recounts that there were more beggars in the realm of Poland than anywhere else. The poor population, therefore, took refuge by hundreds in those ownerless districts on the Dnieper where freedom and a less degrading existence were still to be found, and they found a suitable employment in campaigns against Ottomans and Tartars. From these people arose the avengers of Polish oppression. The same characteristics are shown by the laws passed under Albert's brothers, Alexander I. (1501-1506), and Sigismund the Elder or the Great (1506-1548). The imperial diets were bent on further restricting the royal power. Thus we may call attention to the provision that the king had not to decide anything by himself, but merely to lead the deliberations of the senate; for "an oligarchical government was better than a monarchical." Further, the famous statute *Nihil novi* declared that the king henceforth might not introduce any new measure without

the assent of the senate and the provincial deputies; this strengthened the provisions of 1453 and 1454. High offices were to be conferred according to length of service and not at the caprice of the monarch. Grave consequences ensued from the decree of the diet of 1504, by which the king might not pledge or give away crown lands except with the knowledge of the diet and the assent of the senate. The legislative proposals which aimed at the increase of the defensive powers of the realm are noteworthy, and they would doubtless have achieved their purpose had they been carried out. According to them, not merely were the townsfolk who owned landed property liable to military service, but every tenth man from the country population was to be drafted into the militia, which was intended to form the basis of the nation's military organisation.

The diets under Sigismund frequently occupied themselves with this question. Under him the liberty of the peasants to leave their homes was still more restricted, since they were made solely and absolutely dependent on the lord, while the rights of private jurisdiction were extended. In the legislative enactments of Melnik, of 1501, which, however, are not to be found in the "*Volumina legum*" of Jan Laski (John a Lasco; 1466-1531), it is laid down that, in case the king should prosecute any innocent person, or not conform to the enactments of the council, and act contrary to the well-being of the empire, the whole empire was released from the oath of loyalty and might regard the king as a tyrant and a foe.

Such proceedings could not produce any good impression in Lithuania. When John Albert's brother, Alexander, became Grand Duke of Lithuania, this was done without the assent of Poland. The union, therefore, was formally non-existent. Alexander, in fact, trod in the footsteps of Witold and Casimir, since he similarly entered into alliance with Moscow. Only the war against the Order brought both parties quickly together again.



SWORD OF THE
POLISH KINGS



POLAND UNDER THE JAGELLONS

SEEDS OF DECAY IN THE NATIONAL LIFE

WHEN Sigismund, Casimir's son, mounted the throne of Poland in 1506 Eastern Europe presented a very different political picture from that of a hundred years before. The hardest task of Poland in the course of the three last centuries, the suppression, that is, of the Teutonic Knights in order to occupy the coast of the Baltic, had been performed in 1466. It was high time, for a few decades later it would hardly have been possible.

Threatening clouds gathered in the east and west of Poland just at the close of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth. On the one hand Moscow was arming for an attack on Poland-Lithuania; on the other side the Ottomans were pressing with increasing power. Poland had long enjoyed tranquillity on the side of Moscow, which, groaning under the Tartar rule, had been unable to move. But when Ivan III.

Ivan the Champion of the Orthodox had shaken off the Mongol yoke and had his hands free, he formed comprehensive schemes. He worked for the unification of Russia with skill and good fortune. One district after another was brought over to him.

When he married in 1472 the Byzantine princess Sophia (Zoë), daughter of the despot Thomas of Morea, the last of the race of the Palæologi, he assumed the Byzantine imperial arms, the double-headed eagle, and claimed from Rome the title of Emperor of Russia. He also laid claim to the Russian districts of Poland. The current of anti-Polish feeling in Lithuania was perceived by Ivan III. He therefore came forward as the champion of the Orthodox population of Poland. The Russian party in Lithuania was always strong; and capable men, such as Michael Glinskij, stood at its head. Even in Casimir's days the political conditions in Eastern Europe seemed to have shifted in favour of Moscow.

Since the year 1481, after the Tartars had been beaten, the Lithuanian princes, hitherto friendly towards Poland, began one after the other to go over to the side of Moscow. Alexander, while Grand Duke of Lithuania, was openly pro-Russian. A rapprochement between him and Ivan took place in 1494. Alexander married the

Poland's Stand Against the Catholic Church Princess Helene and waived his claim to a series of towns in favour of his father-in-law. In

the marriage contract he pledged himself not to force Helene to go over to the Catholic religion, and in fact not to allow her to do so "voluntarily." He built a chapel for her in Wilna, and surrounded her only with people of her own creed. We learn from these stipulations that the detrimental influence of the Roman Catholic Church on public policy, against which a stand was being made in Poland, was already recognised in Moscow. Alexander confirmed in 1499 the old rights of the Orthodox Church.

Ivan also knew how to stir up hostility on every side against Poland, and to organise a menacing league against it. He married his son Vasilij to a daughter of Stefan the Great of Moldavia, and thus drew this country into the sphere of his interests. He was allied with the Teutonic Order and friendly with the Tartar Khan Mengli Giray I. (1469-1474 and 1478-1515); he observed an amicable attitude towards Turkey, and would not

Germany and Moscow in Agreement entertain any idea of a league with Poland and Hungary against Turkey. His son Vasilij observed the same policy.

In this attitude towards Poland the Russian princes were met by the German emperor Maximilian, who, as an opponent of the Jagellons in the contest for the crowns of Bohemia and Hungary, found a welcome ally in the Muscovite grand duke. This was the first time that Germany entered into relations with Moscow.

Equally threatening was the attitude of the Sublime Porte. It was the zenith of Ottoman power. Moldavia and Wallachia already wavered in their loyalty as allies of Poland; if they were lost, it would be the turn of the Dniester district. Finally, it lay with the Jagellons to defend the Hungarian crown. This state of things

League Against Poland drove Poland also towards the south and provoked hostilities with Germany. The Hapsburgs, therefore, were eager, in league with Moscow and the Teutonic Order, to close the circle of the enemies of Poland; besides these, Maximilian won over the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Duke of Saxony, and the King of Denmark, for the combination against Poland, as well as a distinct party in Poland itself.

It was thus high time for Sigismund to act. He had concluded an alliance with Hungary in 1507, had renounced Moldavia in favour of Hungary, and married Barbara, sister of John Zapolya, besides winning over Mengli Giray, the Tartar Khan, by "yearly presents" of 15,000 gulden—everything in order to show a bolder front to Maximilian and others—when he suddenly changed his views. Sigismund could not, of course, wage war with all his enemies at one and the same time, and was forced, therefore, to decide whether to turn toward the West or the East. But Maximilian also had cause to seek a peace with Poland. The great struggle between the Hapsburgs and Valois then began. The succession in Milan and Naples aroused this struggle, and both antagonists fought in every part of the world where they could inflict damage on each other.

Sigismund decided for the contest with the East and for the alliance with Maximilian. His brother Ladislaus (Vladislav) II. of Hungary was the intermediary. Thus, on July 22nd, 1515, that memorable treaty

The World Power of the Hapsburgs

between the three monarchs as to the succession, which was decisive not merely for the history of Poland, was arranged in Vienna. The granddaughter of the emperor, Maria, was to marry Lewis, the son of Ladislaus, and Anna, his daughter, was to wed one of the two grandsons of the emperor, Charles or Ferdinand; the emperor went through the form of betrothal with Anna in the name of the not yet selected grandson, in the church

of St. Stephen. It was further decided that, in the event of Lewis dying without issue, the Hungarian crown should devolve on his sister Anna.

This treaty meant the renunciation by the Jagellons of their claims to the crowns of Bohemia and Hungary, and therefore to any power in the West, and founded the world power of the house of Hapsburg, just as it laid the foundations of the later empire of Austria. The day which saw the last Hungarian Jagellon fall at Mohács, August 29th, 1526, was the birthday of the Austrian monarchy.

But this treaty, on the other side, brought advantages to Poland. The emperor no longer supported the Teutonic Order, and did not aim at an armed alliance with the Grand Duke of Moscow, but left Poland a free hand. The situation that had been prepared and created by the battle at Tannenberg was formally recognised and confirmed by Germany so far as such treaties can be binding. The year 1515 forms the last stage in the development of the conditions created by the year 1410. Poland thus entered upon a new chapter

New Chapter in Polish Development

of her historical development. The empire, which had hitherto turned its face toward the west, now turned toward the east—namely, toward Moscow. The contest with this power fills the pages of the history of Poland for the succeeding centuries and decides her fate. Poland, indeed, only gradually recognised the necessity of the struggle. Even Sigismund did not keep this goal steadily before him, though he wavered in his loyalty to Germany.

The Poles, whose country lay on the upper courses of the Oder and the Vistula, must have always struggled to reach the Baltic. This motive, indeed, led to the union with Lithuania, which equally was drawn toward the Baltic. For this reason the Lithuano-Polish union was maintained in the face of all hindrances. In the second treaty of Thorn of 1466 the Poles had reached the goal which the course of their rivers clearly indicated. The same physical necessity caused the change of front in the year 1515. Poland never found the partnership with Hungary profitable; the connection was physically impossible, since a chain of mountains raised a barrier between them. Bohemia and Hungary especially had greater interests in common with Austria than with Poland, which lay on another line.

POLAND UNDER THE JAGELLONS

There the Danube created out of all the surrounding regions a new state, Austria, the necessity of which was proved by the joint wars against the Turks, who wished to dispute with it the possession of the Danube. The influence of geography therefore kept Poland aloof from Hungary, Bohemia and Austria, and indicated to her that abandonment of all interests in Hungary which forms the one side of the treaty of 1515.

But the other side of the treaty, the advance against the East, was qualified by physical conditions. While Western Europe is divided by mountain ranges into many distinct and separate parts, in which individual states could develop apart, since they were protected from their neighbours by Nature. East Europe forms one gigantic plain which, in spite of its expanse, must have favoured the formation of a homogeneous political structure on its whole surface. The waves of nations continually swept on and broke one on the other; the weaker tribes were subjugated, until at last only the strongest survived. Nowhere perhaps has the ethnographical picture changed so often as here—on the sea-coasts, if anywhere.

Many centuries elapsed before a homogeneous political structure arose in this gigantic basin. There were countless tribes there, and countless tribes were fated to fall, until finally, on the question who was to rule over the whole of East Europe, only two nations could come under consideration—the Poles and the Russians. And as soon as they recognised each other as rivals they rushed at each other, just as when in the desert one wild beast crosses the path of another. Properly speaking, the two kindred stocks, since they had similar economic, political, artistic, and even national interests, and to some degree the same enemies, could have quite well united, as was the case with Poland and Lithuania. But it was shown once more how powerfully an idea

dominates man. The two races, educated in different schools, worshipped quite different ideals. It was not the Poles that were fighting against the Russians there, but the Catholic Church against the Orthodox, republicanism against despotism.

What the East European War Meant Hence the bitterness of this East European war; it was a war of two conflicting principles. Moscow had emerged

from the Tartar school hard and barbarised. An implacably stern absolutism had saved Russia from destruction. How, therefore, after this experience, was she to give up her own form of government and join the Western current of ideas? People and prince alike in Russia were so convinced of

the blessing of absolute monarchy that they were readier to go further in that direction rather than to abandon it; especially since in the impending war all the resources of the country stood at the absolute disposal of the despotic ruler, and the nation was so devoted to him that it hardly ventured to murmur under the heaviest oppression. A glance at the development of things in Poland could only strengthen Moscow in this conviction.

Just when the struggle between these two nationalities began, the royal power in Poland had gradually sunk into a phantom monarchy; the king and the nobility

seemed to constitute two hostile, opposing parties. The nobility would not undertake anything unless they received in return some concession or other from the king. The *Slachta* decided on war and peace, and obtained pay for the campaigns outside the borders of the empire. The ravages and losses in war had to be made good to them, and their prisoners of war ransomed by the king. The nobility was desirous of paying as few taxes as possible, and of lightening the burden of their other state duties, and naturally saw with pleasure when the king was freehanded. The kings bore the whole load of responsibility, and often rescued the realm from distress merely by the weight of their personality and with



SIGISMUND I.: AN ENERGETIC RULER

During his reign, from 1506 till 1548, Sigismund I. was endeavouring to strengthen the monarchy and to pass wise laws. All his efforts, however, were unable to check the seeds of decay which had taken root in the national soil.

their own means. These nobles, again, cared nothing for economy or work; work was the concern of the peasants. These latter, therefore, and the king were the martyrs of the commonweal. And the class which possessed the most power in the state regarded the highest interests of the kingdom as something almost foreign.

Poland's Weakness in Battle How could Poland under such conditions be a strong state? These weaknesses came to light in all the wars which Poland waged in the fifteenth century. The whole management of the war against the Teutonic Order, which, after the year 1410, was enfeebled, was a discredit to Poland as a state; and all the more so since there were brave soldiers and competent officers enough in the country. Nevertheless, the Polish nobility was proud of its imperial constitution and its personal privileges. Its freedom appeared to it in a peculiarly brilliant light when it saw how in the neighbouring kingdom the intellectual life was stunted under the oppression of the despotic tsar.

We see here the strange phenomenon of two nations alarmed at the defects which each noticed in the other, and driven to exaggerate their own good qualities. The Russians enlarged the despotic power of the tsar to a monstrous degree; the Poles strengthened the freedom of the individual so greatly that the unity and liberty of the kingdom were destroyed. The two countries, apart from isolated personalities, who wished now and again to stay the evils, but could not carry their purpose through, did not adopt a middle course between the two extremes or any other solution of the problem.

Let us consider other circumstances in order to determine what were the intentions of each of the two opponents in the impending struggle. Although Poland was weaker as a state, yet it was benefited by the higher civilisation and

Culture and Religion in Poland the support of Rome, so that it came forward in the contest with the East as the representative of Europe in the interests of culture and religion. It could boast also of the sympathies of Europe, which did not, however, go beyond wordy agreements, and did not prevent the Western Powers from attacking Poland itself on a favourable occasion. Poland at first made great progress. But then only too soon the difficulty of her task was apparent.

If Poland was resolved to carry Roman Catholicism to the East, she was destined to learn that Greek orthodoxy was being organised and grouped round Moscow as its representative. And even those aristocratic liberties which the Poles thought to disseminate in the East were accompanied by conditions which were fatal to them, since a heavy oppression of the country population went hand in hand with them. These two movements, the religious and the social, could not but cause widespread agitation among the population, which led to revolts and the ultimate loss of the Ukraine. The Poles finally became conscious that a concentration of all their energies was necessary in order to face the hard struggle. But it was at this point that the capabilities of the highly gifted and patriotic people failed. The old proverb, "*Rzecz pospolita cnota stoi*" (the republic exists by virtue), was no longer applicable, since civic virtue had disappeared from Poland.

Sigismund and his son, Sigismund Augustus, the last two Jagellons, clearly perceived the root of the malady from which the Polish nation suffered.

The Sigismunds Endeavour to Check Decay The period of their reigns is therefore an unbroken series of attempts to change the constitution, to stem the arrogance of the nobles, to strengthen the monarchy, and to pass wise laws; and we must admit that they showed abundant proofs of good intentions, energy, perseverance, and self-sacrifice. We see them and their successors continually at war with the disorder and anarchy in the country, but also notice how uselessly they spent their efforts in this unequal contest and were unable, try as they might, to check the universal progress of decay. Sigismund (1506-1548) soon showed his incapacity for the weighty task. Even before 1515 he was involved in war with Moscow, and gained some successes; but the war could no longer be prosecuted energetically. It was the same in the second war, which broke out in 1533. Moldavia was already on the side of Moscow. Sigismund here displayed marked feebleness toward Germany. When, in 1518, he married as his second wife Bona Sforza of Milan, the daughter of Giovanni Galeazzo, who died in 1494, and thus became nephew of the Emperor Maximilian, he seems to have let himself be influenced by Germany, as Jagiello once did.

POLAND UNDER THE JAGELLONS

The brilliance of the imperial title induced him to form a friendship with Ferdinand I., and to ask the hand of Elizabeth, the emperor's daughter, for his son Sigismund Augustus. But he did not make full use of this alliance with Germany. Thus, he did not declare war, for example, against the Order, whose Grand Master persistently refused to do homage until after the death of Maximilian in 1519. But even then he did not understand how to retain his advantage. In 1521 a truce for four years was concluded by the good services of the Emperor Charles V., who once more tried to play off the Teutonic Order against Poland.

The Reformation made nowhere such rapid progress as in Prussia under the rule of the monastic knights, and by Luther's advice it was resolved to change the lands of the Order into a secular duchy. The Grand Master, Albert of Brandenburg, a son of Frederic of Anspach and Sophia, Sigismund's sister, who died in 1513, and therefore a nephew of Sigismund, entered Cracow at the beginning of April, 1525, laid aside the dress of the Order, and did homage to the king on the great square at Cracow as a secular prince and hereditary duke of Prussia. The duke pledged himself to be a loyal vassal to the king, and to aid him in war with a hundred knights, and renounced his right of coinage. He received in return the first place in the Senate at the king's side. On the extinction of his descendants in the male line Prussia was to fall to Poland.

There was little cause for Poland to rejoice at this conclusion of the matter. For now the place of a periodically elected Grand Master was filled by a hereditary German duke, and, what was a far weightier matter, the country, owing to the Reformation, assumed a thoroughly German character. The old enemy reappeared in a form still more dangerous to Poland. So weak and short-sighted was Polish policy, that even after the death

of Duke Albert II. Frederic on August 27th, 1618, the fief was not resumed according to the meaning of the compact, but was transferred to the Kur-Brandenburg elder line of the Hohenzollerns. The complete severance of Prussia from the Polish crown could only be a question of time; it was destined to take place in 1659, when Poland, completely surrounded by enemies, was in the greatest straits, and a formidable danger was threatening from the East. Even now Moscow and Prussia united against Poland, and their friendship soon became traditional.

It was but a slight compensation that Sigismund united the western Masovian principalities with his own crown after the extinction of the Piasts in those parts. It was fortunate for Poland that with true discernment he maintained friendly relations with Turkey.

In spite of his circumspection and foresight Sigismund, though personally an efficient ruler, who reduced to order the chaos of the imperial finances, did not achieve a complete success in any direction. How could the vast empire make a bold show when the nobility evinced no patriotism, but were bent on their own advantages and the increase of their privileges, and only too often prejudiced the respect due to the crown? Even under

Jagiello, the Slachta, when the king had refused to cede some privilege, had hacked in pieces before his eyes the deed of acknowledgment intended for them. They had threatened Casimir, the son of Jagiello, with deposition. The same scenes were repeated now.

Maximilian, who, even before 1515, stood in strained relations with Sigismund, succeeded in bringing over a part of the nobles to his side. The Slachta refused the king the supplies for the war against Moscow. Christopher Szydlowiecki, one of the most influential ministers of Sigismund, prided himself on having received from Maximilian 80,000 gulden, without being conscious that he was guilty of high treason.



SIGISMUND II.

He was heir to his father's difficulties as well as to his father's throne, but he was an able ruler, and his governing genius revealed itself in matters of foreign policy. Known also as Augustus I., he reigned from 1548 till 1572.

For the same reasons Sigismund was unable to carry on the war against the Order with the necessary vigour. When, in 1537, he summoned the nobility to a campaign against Moldavia, and some 150,000 men assembled at Lemberg, these masses would not march to the war, but became rebellious and demanded legisla-

Polish Troops Become Rebellious tive reforms. An attempt on the king's life was actually made in the diet of 1523. But when in 1538 it was proposed

to punish severely the crimes of public outrage and lèse majesté recourse was had to Roman law, since the national code was deficient. It deserves to be specially noticed that the custom now began to develop of allowing no law to pass without the common consent. This fundamental principle led ultimately to the "liberum veto."

This state of things lasted under Sigismund II. Augustus (also called Augustus I.; 1548-1572), son of Sigismund I. He was much wiser than his father, so that he accomplished notable results, both in foreign policy and in the field of internal reforms.

Sigismund Augustus was able to make an important conquest on the Baltic Sea. The Livonian section of the Teutonic Order was then approaching its dissolution, and Poland required to keep watch on the forthcoming negotiations as to the succession. The Order had never reached such power and prosperity in Livonia as in Prussia. For one thing, the stream of immigrating Germans was less full there; for another, the continual struggle between the Order and the archbishopric of Riga prevented any close amalgamation of the estates of the realm. The provincial bishops did not shrink from looking for outside aid. Thus the last Archbishop of Riga allied himself with Poland, and put himself formally under the protection of the Polish king, conduct intensely exasperating to the Order, which had always

The Baltic Supremacy in the Balance shown a national spirit. Poland and Russia had a keen interest in the decision of the Livonian question. The pos-

session of this rich and populated country, and through it of an important position on the Baltic, was worth the greatest sacrifices. The supremacy on the Baltic simply depended upon the sovereignty of the old German colony. Russia was still more interested, although in spite of the "historic" rights put forward by the

tsars, no Russian prince ruled on these coasts until 1721. Russia was pressing forward in the sixteenth century with redoubled strength; access to the ocean was essential for her, if she wished to become a great power in Europe.

But Sweden and Denmark had an equally marked interest in the solution of the Livonian question; the former, because she had planted foot on the north and east shores of the Gulf of Finland, and found the advance of Russia a menace to these possessions; the latter, because since the days of Waldemar II. she raised claims to Esthonia. If we reflect that the empire with which Livonia was politically united, and from religious reasons Rome also, must have had interests at stake, we shall comprehend how the Livonian question might grow into a European one.

The prospects of Poland were the most favourable, and the Polish king adopted the most practical measures. Not only had Sigismund I. (who was still on the throne) always opportunity as patron of the archbishopric of Riga to interfere in the internal affairs of Livonia, but he had also

German Princes on the Side of Poland a loyal ally in Duke Albert of Prussia, his Hohenzollern vassal, who, as former Grand Master, exercised a great influence on the Order in Livonia, and was willing to employ it for the benefit of Poland. He succeeded in raising his brother William to be coadjutor, and in 1539 to be Archbishop of Riga, and thus strengthened his influence in that direction.

The Curia supported the Polish king in everything; and for this reason Sigismund Augustus was obliged to proceed cautiously in matters of reformation in his empire, and to try and hinder any general defection from Rome. Poland, as well as William himself and his brother Albert of Prussia, entertained the idea of secularising the archbishopric of Riga, as had been the case with Prussia. William selected as the heir to his plans his kinsman, the young Duke Christopher of Mecklenburg, formerly bishop of Ratzeburg, who was also nearly related to the King of Poland.

Thus the most powerful princes of North-Eastern Germany now made common cause with Poland. Christopher, in spite of the protests of the Livonian states, was elevated to the post of coadjutor of the archbishop. Moscow also had achieved some success. In the year 1554 the Livonian Order had

concluded a treaty with Ivan IV., in which it agreed never to enter into an alliance with Poland, and to remain neutral in case of war, besides paying a contribution from the bishopric of Dorpat of one mark per head.

The outbreak of war was brought on in 1556 by an intercepted letter from the bishop to his brother Albert of Prussia, in which there was mention of his plans directed against the Order. The archbishop was arrested as a traitor, his castles and seats were occupied, the archbishopric confiscated, and the management of it handed over to the bishops of Dorpat and Oesel. The outbreak of the war, which, in distinction from that of 1700 to 1718, is usually called the First Northern War, was accelerated, since, on the death of the Grand Master, Heinrich von Galen, Wilhelm von Fürstenberg, a man of warlike propensities, was elected Master (1559). But it was now seen that the days of the Livonian Order were numbered.

While Sigismund Augustus stood with 100,000 men on the frontier of Courland, the Knights were hardly able to put 10,000 men, including land-knechts and peasants, into the field. Internal feuds broke up the forces of the country. The Order was compelled, therefore, to yield without a struggle, to ask the Polish king for forgiveness, and to reinstate the archbishop with his coadjutor. The declaration of war by Moscow was made in November, 1557. And now the general war began. The Knights of the Order and their vassals performed many heroic feats in it, but confusion, discouragement, and treachery prevented the classes agreeing on united action.

As once before in the hour of need in Prussia, so also here a movement was made against the Order, and once more the intrigues were due to the Polish party, who raised their supporter Gotthard Kettler to the Mastership; Poland thus immediately gained a great advantage from the election. Kettler, it is true, wished to preserve his independence, and sought help from the Holy Roman Empire, the Teutonic Order, and other powers, but, as he himself said later, found no consolation from anyone, while the disturbances in the country grew worse.

The Grand Master and the archbishop, weary of the disorders, soon surrendered to the Polish king. The treaty was signed

on November 28th, 1561. The territory of the Order was secularised. Gotthard Kettler returned to secular rank, and received Courland as a fief with the title of the Duke of Courland and Semgallen, and also a seat and vote in the Polish Senate. Mitau, not Riga, was assigned him as residence. All the country beyond the Dwina, Riga included, was incorporated in the Polish Empire, while the king at the same time confirmed all the privileges of the country, secured to it a German government, German language, and the freedom of the Augsburg Confession, and also promised to obtain the sanction of the German Empire to these treaties, by which Livonia was separated from the empire. The government of Livonia was entrusted to the Duke Kettler. On the basis of this *Privilegium Sigismundi Augusti* the territory of the Order was able to maintain its German character for 300 years. In the year 1562 all the estates of the realm, and twenty years later Riga, agreed to the treaty.

Poland gained a further advantage, by the friendly overtures of Sweden. John III., brother of the Swedish king, Eric XIV., married in 1562 Katherine, the daughter of the Polish king; the son of this marriage became king of Poland as Sigismund III. in 1587. Sweden came into the possession of Reval and Esthonia with the consent of Poland. But even Denmark gained some advantages, for the Danish prince Magnus, obtained the bishopric of Oesel by treachery. Moscow, which persistently continued the war and made devastating inroads, was obliged to be content with Dorpat. But this was ceded to Poland in 1582.

Attempts had been made at numerous imperial diets to reform the judicial system, the common law, the system of taxation, and the constitution of the army, but almost fruitlessly, since often what had been once accepted was again rejected. If we cast our eyes over the legislation of Poland from 1500 to 1560 or so, we are astonished at its sterility; so little was passed, so much was merely discussed. Sigismund Augustus only succeeded in effecting some improvement towards the close of his reign. Even under his father, the nobles in the imperial diets of 1535-1536 had demanded and agreed to a revision of the statute-

**Additions
to the
Empire**

**Poland at
War with
the Knights**

**Poland's
Sterile
Legislation**

book. In the course of time resolutions had been passed by the imperial diets which were contradictory to each other; thus, for example, the privileges of the monasteries and the clergy, as well as the jurisdiction of the bishops and the immunity from taxation enjoyed by the clergy, were inconsistent with the laws of

Clerical Privileges Abolished the country affecting the taxation of property, and with the military constitution connected therewith, as well as, on the other hand, with the statute *Neminem Captivabimus* and with the sovereignty of the nobles generally. Even under Casimir III. the *Slachta* had opposed the privileges of the clerics, and the king thus succeeded in breaking down the excessive power of the Church.

The tendency everywhere was to abolish all privileges, whether belonging to classes or individuals. There was also a general wish to abolish the *Incompatibilia*, or questionable concentration of several offices in one person. It was further important from the standpoint of the royal treasury and national taxation to organise and classify the crown lands which had been pawned or given away in large quantities, and were held on illegal titles. Their occupants were now forced to give them up, and thus a fund was created which was large enough to cover the most necessary outgoings of the kingdom, and by which the nobility could be relieved of their burdens. But the most important reform was to abolish the privileges of individual provinces and to bring them under one law, in order to put an end to their efforts for independence and to the lawless state of things. To these belonged in the first line Lithuania, then Masovia, Prussia, Livonia, and finally Zator and Oswiecim (Auschwitz in Galicia), which John Albert had acquired. All these legislative labours were comprised under the name "execution of the laws," and the

The Days of Religious Prosperity nobility at every opportunity noisily clamoured for their acceptance. The future political and social structure of the kingdom was dependent on this reform; so was the solution of the religious question; for Protestantism at that particular time had received a great stimulus in Poland. The freedom which Poland enjoyed was favourable to the spread of various doctrines. Humanism had found a great response

there; and with it the Hussite movement, which it fostered, was so widely spread that the Hussites were supported in the towns and even among the nobles. The Lutheran teaching found the ground still better cleared, because the old Hussite doctrine had not yet died out, the power of the clergy was limited, and freedom of conscience was now traditional.

Lutheran ideas were disseminated in Poland as early as the year 1518. In Dantzic the monk Jacob Knade successfully raised his voice against the abuses of the Church. Even in Great and Little Poland, and in other provinces, preachers came forward. Only in ultra-conservative Masovia did the new doctrine find no followers. The nobility greedily grasped at the new teaching, and not less greedily the citizens of the towns. We soon find followers of the Calvinistic teaching, which in Poland was spread perhaps still more successfully, besides Anti-Trinitarians, Socinians, Bohemian Brethren, Arians and others.

Powerful noble families adopted the new doctrines and took them under their protection. They raised centres of the new teaching on their estates. Many priests and monks, and even bishops, opposed the Catholic Church. Religious innovations found patronage even at the royal court, and secret meetings were held at the house of the queen's confessor, a Franciscan. The court preacher was a friend of the movement. The heir to the throne, Sigismund Augustus, at that time still grand duke of Lithuania, was considered a supporter of the new teaching; it was only towards the end of his life that he came forward as a zealous Catholic.

The king, under the pressure of the bishops and the Curia, was at first moved to adopt severe measures. In the years 1520, 1522 and 1523 he forbade the dissemination of Lutheran books on pain of confiscation of property. The synod in Lenčzyca published in 1523 the bull of excommunication issued by Leo X. against Luther, excommunicated for its own part all heretics, and introduced a clerical censorship by giving priests the right to institute searches in private houses. The king was petitioned to renew the old Hussite statute of Wielun dating from the year 1424; according to which heresy was to be punished as *lèse majesté* and to be subject to episcopal jurisdiction. The



THE REJOICING CELEBRATION OF THE UNION OF POLAND AND LITHUANIA
This interesting event in the history of Eastern Europe was performed on July 1st 1869. The union was in fact an incorporation by Poland of Lithuania which henceforth ceased to be an independent state. When the oath to the treaty was administered, the two parties shed tears but while Poland's tears were of joy those of Lithuania were of sorrow.

inquisition was introduced in the year 1527; in 1534, it was forbidden to attend the University of Wittenberg, and in 1541, on pain of loss of nobility, to keep priests who were independent of Rome. And later the episcopate, consolidated by the exclusion of its doubtful members, developed a successful energy, especially when the

Execution the Punishment of Heresy

vigorous Bishop of Ermland, Stanislaus Hosius, took the lead in the Catholic reaction.

But all these measures against the new doctrines bore little fruit. King Sigismund had acted with severity only in Dantzic, when he went there in March, 1526, to suppress heresy, and ordered thirteen citizens to be executed in the market place without a trial; and that though he had earlier sworn "by the king's honour, helmet and sword," and under letter and seal, to shed no blood, but to establish peace and concord. This was indeed of small avail; Prussia remained the first country where the Lutheran doctrine was promoted to be the national religion.

But then the king relaxed in his zeal. When Dr. Johann Eck challenged him to proceed in the spirit of Henry VIII., he answered him, in 1528: "The times are changed, and with them the rulers and the spirit of the legislators; sciences decay and others blossom. King Henry may write against Luther—you will allow me to be king of the sheep as well as of the goats." So he adopted mild measures. His son Sigismund Augustus did the same. One case only is known where Sigismund allowed the burning of a woman, Katharina Malcher; otherwise the bishops at most let some innovators die in prison without a trial. So under Sigismund Augustus, only once was a woman burnt at the stake.

The prohibition on visiting foreign universities was removed in 1543, since it was totally impossible to enforce it. Sigismund Augustus, who often asserted

Nobility and Clergy in Opposition

he would be no judge over men's consciences, acted with equal, or, perhaps, greater leniency. The bitterness between

the nobility and the clergy meanwhile grew more intense, since the former would not recognise the episcopal jurisdiction. "We only wish," said Jan Tarnowski, "to submit to the king's court, and if the king merely executed the will of the bishops, our slavery would be worse than the Turkish; for the least suspicion

would suffice to stamp any man as a heretic. No injustice is done to the bishops, for as members of the Senate they will be, in some sort, judges with us in matters of heresy." And when the Bishop of Cracow, Zebrzydowski, answered him, "What shall I be if I am not to be judge over heresy—beadle or bishop?" Tarnowski remarked to him, "It is better for you to be a beadle than for me to be a slave." It is exhilarating to hear with what manly courage the nobles defended their freedom.

The young Rafael Leszczynski once, during Mass in the cathedral, while the king and bishops were kneeling, put his cap on his head. This breach of decorum was aimed at the bishop, not the religion. In Poland, freedom was prized beyond everything, while earthly honours were despised. Things went so far that full liberty of conscience was demanded for the serfs. The Poles showed that they were truly a nation of free men. The young Rafael was then chosen marshal of the imperial diet, in defiance of the bishops who had impeached him before

The Poles a Nation of Free Men

the king. It was wished to abolish the episcopal jurisdiction, in order to bring the clergy under the laws of the country.

This was intended to be decided at once as a main feature of the programme of legislative revision.

The matter was not easy, and the king long hesitated. If he decided in favour of the bishops and recognised their jurisdiction, dangerous results would follow; on the other hand, no right of deciding religious questions could be conferred with propriety upon the secular judges. The king, therefore, postponed the decision and resolved to temporise, although in principle, according to the sense of the old laws, he recognised the episcopal jurisdiction. Possibly the Livonian question deterred him from breaking off with the Curia, whose help he required.

In spite of, or rather on account of, this great freedom, Protestantism could not strike root deeply in Poland. In Germany it was a reaction against the encroachments of the Church; there it had sprung up out of the existing conditions, like a wild plant. In Poland the Church could not allow herself any great abuses, and Protestantism was accordingly regarded as an imported luxury. Most people played with it, to show that they were at

liberty to hold different views. When, then, the Catholic Church renewed her vigour at the Council of Trent, and clearly proclaimed her object, the Counter Reformation in Poland had an easy task. While in the West the Reformation had been mostly suppressed with bloodshed, in Poland the Counter Reformation was carried out almost unnoticed; even such influential opponents as Stanislaus Orzechowski went over again to the Catholic Church. Only the animosity between the Roman Catholic Church and the Greek Orthodoxy grew more bitter.

A side movement, started by the Reformation, deserves our notice—the wish for a national church. The preachers employed everywhere the popular dialect in spreading their teaching, and thus revived the national languages. This had already been done to some degree in Poland by Hussitism, and Protestantism now developed the Polish language to higher perfection. If the Polish language ousted Latin in Poland in the sixteenth century and created a national literature, this golden age, as elsewhere, was primarily inaugurated by the Protestant movement. The dialects, now awakened to fresh life, forced their way into the church services. While in the West the opponents of the Catholic Church aimed at extending the independence of their own national churches, seeking in France a Gallican national church and in England establishing the Anglican national church, Poland also wished for the establishment of a national church with a Slavonic liturgy and more or less complete independence from Rome. And the opposition wished to win the king over to this plan.

But since this would have necessarily brought with it a change of the constitution, this point also formed part of the programme of the Revision or "Execution of the Laws." Finally the king, in 1562, soon after the acquisition of Livonia, determined in favour of the Execution. A start was made with the easiest part of the demands, namely, the crown lands and the *Incompatibilia*; the *Slachta* understood originally by this the abolition generally of all special privileges. But by the influence of the queen the question of the confiscation of the mortgaged crown lands was first dealt with; she wished by the multiplication of crown lands to

found a dynasty, as had been done in the case of other royal families.

As under Sigismund, a resolution passed by the imperial diet in the year 1504 was chosen as the starting-point, by which the pledging of crown property was made dependent on the sanction of the Senate. Some grandees under Sigismund had torn their grants of privileges in pieces and thrown them at the king's feet, and there were now some such who resigned their offices if they filled two or more. But when a serious attempt was made to confiscate the crown lands, such difficulties cropped up that the whole scheme melted away.

Sigismund Augustus himself showed the greatest self-sacrifice, since he agreed that a fourth part of the revenues of all the crown lands should be applied to cover the expenses of the army, and took for his share exclusively those estates about which it had not been decided whether they should be confiscated. In the future the management of the army was often assigned to this royal fourth. This, indeed, was estimated at so low a figure that it had later to be doubled.

The question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction then came up. After great discussions the king decided in favour of a compromise, which recognised the jurisdiction of the Church, but withdrew from it the secular arm. This law was so formulated in 1565 that municipal starosts could not be made responsible by the ecclesiastical authorities for the execution of commands. But the party of reform demanded that the clergy and nobility should be placed on a precisely equal footing with regard to the burdens of taxation and military service. Only the presence of the papal legate, Francis Commendone, a skilled diplomat, who knew how to smooth the ruffled waters, spared the Catholic Church in Poland new humiliations. He was vigorously supported by Bishop Hosius of Ermland, who had represented Poland at the Council of Trent in brilliant style, and had composed a new *confessio fidei* adopted by the whole Catholic Church.

Commendone recommended the clergy, in order to preserve their other rights, not to evade the duty of paying taxes; the Church tithe was therefore a tax. The attempt of the legate to introduce into Poland the resolutions of the Council

**The King
Sacrifices
Revenue**

**Poland's Desire
for a
National Church**

**Catholic Church
Escapes
Humiliations**

of Trent met with great difficulties ; a part of the clergy opposed several of the enactments. Thanks only to the good offices of the king, who declared he wished to live and die a Catholic, the Catholic Church finally conquered her opponents, who were in a more unfavourable position from the very first, since they were split up into many

How the Catholic Church Triumphed

parties. All the plans of the opposition—the national church, the national synod, and the complete abolition of clerical jurisdiction—remained unfulfilled, although it tried to win over the king to its cause by meeting his wishes in all his private affairs. On the contrary, he accepted from the hand of the legate the resolutions of the Council of Trent, gave them validity in Poland, and published an ordinance which banished foreign religious innovators from the country ; indeed, he even wished, in concession to the wishes of the legate, to allow no religious discussions between the Catholics and the zealous reformers. The Catholic Church did not approve of disputations, judging correctly that they could not be profitable to the faith.

The laws as to the *Incompatibilia*, as well as that touching the duty of an official to reside on the scene of his duties, were once more strictly enforced, both for secular office-holders, and, in the meaning of the resolutions of Trent, also for spiritual dignitaries.

But the revision affected also the privileges of the towns, since the export of goods to foreign countries was prohibited—a prohibition which was certain to undermine the welfare not only of the towns, but also of the whole empire. The nobility alone were to be permitted to export raw materials. Since the importation of foreign goods was still allowed, it will be understood how the development of home industries was thus sapped.

Polish Industries Sapped

sufficiently this important branch of human energy and national prosperity. The prejudiced notion that work is unworthy of a nobleman, and that trade and industrial undertakings are ignoble, has survived there until modern times.

In Poland the value of the towns and their importance for culture and industry was not recognised till it was too late. In a dialogue, written about this time by Lucas Gornicki, between a Pole and an

Italian, the Pole will not allow himself to be convinced of the necessity for towns, which became everywhere the centres of political and social life and of culture, and points to the Tartars, who, indeed, had no towns. Towns and the citizen class were never able to develop in Poland. Owing to the depression in trade and industries which then set in, wealthy citizens began to have recourse to agriculture. Poland did not rise beyond an agrarian standpoint, and was therefore exploited by Italian, English, and Scottish traders. No sufficient use was made of her position on the Baltic. Instead of favouring the Baltic trade, the Poles burdened Dantzic with taxes, and brought matters to such a pitch that this busy town often looked round for other patrons. No one in Poland took any interest in commerce.

All these enactments, by which the privileges of the magnates, the bishops, and the towns were partly limited, partly abolished, made the chamber of provincial deputies the most powerful institution in the state—a circumstance which, in view of the low education of the *Slachta* and the

Lithuania's Independent Position

one-sided representation of their class rights, could not conduce to the national prosperity. In 1563 an important ordinance was passed by which the Orthodox Greek nobility in Lithuania were conceded the same rights which the Catholics possessed ; henceforward any Boyar was admissible to any office. The nobility, incensed at the connection of the king with the Catholic Church, refused other important proposals of the king, such as the reform of the army and finance, the order of the election to the throne, and others.

A complete unification of the empire in place of loosely compacted unions was the more urgently demanded ; the king, with the prospect of a dangerous war with Moscow before his eyes, was himself in favour of the scheme. But the Lithuanians offered a stubborn resistance. Their embassy, with Nicholas Radziwill the Black at its head, after pointing to the independent position of Lithuania and the previous measures of union, declared for a personal union, even if a restricted one, demanded diets of their own, a revision of the frontiers of Lithuania and Poland, and a special coronation of the king as Grand Duke of Lithuania. The king stood on the side of the Polish crown, and

was resolved to incorporate Lithuania with it. To facilitate the execution of this plan, he cleared away the last legal obstacle by waiving his hereditary rights in Lithuania, and thus placing both parts in equal relations to his person.

When the Lithuanian deputation left the Polish diet, in order in this way to prevent the incorporation of their country, the king nevertheless declared his intention to carry it out. The entreaties of the envoys, who implored the king with tears to protect them, were unavailing. On the Polish side there was talk of war if Lithuania offered resistance. Thus in 1569, at the imperial diet at Lublin, the "union," which was in fact an incorporation of Lithuania, was definitely carried. Podlachia, Kiev, and Volhynia, districts which had originally been Lithuanian, and for a long time a disputed possession, were first united with the Polish crown in a special act. Only the use of the Russian language in law courts was granted them. Lithuania lost its richest provinces. Any man who refused to recognise this act was held to have forfeited his titles and property.

Poland in Tears of Joy There was no idea of serious opposition, since the lesser Lithuanian nobility, who were jealous of the magnates, remained loyal to Poland, in order by the closer union with Poland to obtain the same rights which the lesser nobility in Poland possessed. Thus on July 1st, 1569, the union was proclaimed, and both sides swore to it. Lithuania only retained its own officials, and therefore ceased to be an independent state. Both parties shed tears when the oaths to the treaty were administered, only with the distinction that in the case of the Lithuanians they were tears of sorrow; in that of the Poles, tears of joy. What the first Jagellon, Vladislav II., in 1386, 1401, and 1413 had, so to say, merely promised, the last really accomplished.

After this the union of Prussia, Livonia, and the other provinces was carried through, and the amalgamation was complete. Poland now was united. This was a great political and economical gain. Nothing now stood in the way of Polish colonisation in the vast Russo-Lithuanian regions; and the stream of German and Polish colonists to the eastern provinces swelled from year to year.

But the chief source of weakness to the empire was not thus removed. This lay

not so much in the constitutional relations of individual parties as in the impotence of the crown—that is to say, in the Polish constitution, which threatened to degenerate into an anarchy. This evil was bound to spread over every province equally. Nothing occurred to strengthen the central administration; on the contrary, the Slachta, in view of the king being childless, of the question of succession, and of the election to the crown, feared to lose in power, and to have diminished rights even in the religious question.

The Great Weakness of Poland

The future of the religious parties depended to a great extent on the attitude of the king towards this question; and both parties, the Catholic no less than the united non-Catholic, cherished the idea of choosing a king after their own heart by an electoral compact. Since for the moment the non-Catholics were in the majority, there were many among the minority to whom the principle of a majority in the resolutions of the parliament seemed dangerous. They demanded the legal introduction of "unanimity." They clearly saw the necessity of a strict government, but liberty was more valuable in their eyes than order. Since a general assent was necessary in adopting resolutions, the *liberum veto* now really existed, although it was first claimed as a right in 1652.

Sigismund and Sigismund Augustus failed, therefore, in their efforts to strengthen the power of the sovereign. The latter, while still Grand Duke of Lithuania, married, after the death of his first wife, without the consent of the Senate, Barbara, the daughter of the Castellan Radziwill. His father and the Slachta disapproved; the nation was reluctant to recognise Barbara as queen. In order that his bride might be crowned, the king adopted a conciliatory attitude toward the nobles. After the death of his deeply loved Barbara, he married the second

Augustus Succumbs to Weight of Cares daughter of Emperor Maximilian II., Katharina, a sister of his first wife, Elizabeth. Since he had no

issue by her, he wished to be divorced from her and to marry again. But Rome and the clergy, whom the king tried equally to propitiate by concessions, were opposed to his wish. He thus did not face either one or the other Order with firmness. Overwhelmed by cares, Sigismund II. Augustus died on July 14th, 1572.



THE LAST STAND OF A GREAT POLISH GENERAL AT THE BATTLE OF CECORA IN 1620

During the reign of Sigismund III., from 1587 till 1632, Poland was frequently on the battlefield. Led by the famous General Zolkiewski, the Polish troops, in 1620, went to the assistance of the Palatine of Moldavia, but were put to flight by an overwhelming army of Tartars. Zolkiewski fell fighting at Cecora, and Poland's nationality disappeared a century and a half later.



THE DECLINE OF POLAND

A NATION BETRAYED BY ITS NOBLES

AFTER the death of the last Jagellon, whose reign seemed in the memory of the nation a period of power and glory, a period of decay set in, which ended with the political downfall of the country. The constitution was, in isolated points, logically completed, according to the principle of the most absolute authority of the individual, and was used to the full by every individual in his own interest without regard for the common good. After the extinction of the Jagellon dynasty, Poland was proclaimed an elective monarchy. The primate of the kingdom, the Archbishop of Gnesen, obtained thereby wide privileges. The conduct of state affairs during the interregnum—the summoning of the elective diet, the acceptance or rejection of candidatures, and the proclamation of the name of the elected—devolved upon him. Catholicism in Poland

The Pivot of European Diplomacy

was thus once more greatly strengthened. There was no dearth of candidates, and the political situation might well be learnt from the promises of the representatives of the European sovereigns. Above all, on this occasion the hostility between France and Austria, the pivot on which the diplomacy of Europe then turned, cast its shadow on Poland. Both opponents brought forward their candidates and fought each other with traditional bitterness even on Polish soil. France relied on her friendship with Turkey; Austria offered an alliance with Spain and Denmark against Turkey; both held out the prospect of further advantages. France promised the formation of a fleet and the organisation of the finances and army; Austria, a favourable solution of the Livonian, Prussian, and other questions; both powers threw money by handfuls among the senators and the Slachta.

But the King of Sweden also announced his candidature as husband of Katharina, one of the Jagellon stock, and promised an alliance against Moscow. There was, how-

ever, among the Slachta a strong party (that which under Sigismund Augustus had deserved the greatest credit for the reform of the legislature) which recommended the candidature of the Tsar of Moscow, and laid stress on the great benefit for Poland which would proceed from this

New King Supported by the Clergy

course, as formerly from the union with Lithuania. But Ivan the Terrible seemed devoid of ambition; he sent his embassy and courteously announced the conditions on which he would accept the crown of Poland. Once again native candidates, from envy and unpopularity, were insufficiently supported by their countrymen.

Henry, Duke of Anjou, brother of the King of France, and his heir-presumptive, was elected in the middle of May, 1573, not merely because French diplomacy was clever, but because his Catholicism found favour with the high clergy. He was also supported by the papal legate, who henceforth intervened at every election of a Polish king in the interests of the Church, and always with success. This success was aided by the circumstance that royal elections henceforward were held in the fields near Warsaw, where many of the strictly Catholic Masovians could take part. Ten thousand of them appeared at the election of Henry.

The Slachta once again had an opportunity of imposing conditions on their king, which were as humiliating as possible. The king, hitherto, could only more or less maintain his position by three means: he

The Slachta Humiliates King Henry

had the right, first, when confronted with conflicting resolutions of the diet, to make one of them law or to "conclude"; secondly, to confer the vacant offices of state, with which he could reward his adherents and create a party for himself; and, finally, to call out the militia, and therefore often practically decided upon war or peace. The new king, on the contrary, was no longer to possess the

right of "conclusion"; the Senate was to decide on war and peace, and the diet was to summon the army. The freedom of denominations was proclaimed, and the title "heir to the empire" was erased from the royal title. Should the king act contrary to these terms, the nation was justified in refusing him obedience. Besides this, Henry pledged him-

The King's Flight from Poland

self to build a fleet at his own cost, to keep up 4,000 soldiers, and to pay the debts of the empire. However suspicious these pacts were, the new king subscribed them and took the oath to the constitution.

If the people did not see in the king the first power in the empire, but almost an enemy to their liberties, they still regarded the monarchy as a brilliant post, for which there were always candidates, of whom, indeed, nothing more could be predicated than that they wished to gratify their pride. It goes without saying that many candidates put themselves to great expense, that other countries had a welcome plea for intervention, which Poland bought by her moral degradation, and that a contested election threw the land into civil war. But the Slachta was still lulled in the sweet dream of liberty and security. The connection with France might, perhaps, have been profitable to Poland; but Henry fled on July 17th, 1574, in order to place on his own head the crown of France after the death of his brother Charles IX. His reign left behind no traces beyond those of the resolutions adopted at his election.

Even at the next elections the candidates of the Roman Catholic party came to the front; thus, Stefan Bathori, Prince of Transylvania, who reigned from 1576 to 1586; then Sigismund Vasa of Sweden, the son of John III. and of Katharina the Jagellon, from 1587 to 1632; he was followed by his sons, Vladislav, who ruled till 1648, and John Casimir, who in 1668 resigned the

Candidates for the Polish Throne

crown and went to France. Then two natives (Piasts) were elected—Michael Wisnioweck (1669-1673), of a rich and respected family; then John Sobieski. Next came a double election. The one party chose Stanislaus Lesczynski, a native, who was supported by Sweden and France in the war known as the first War of the Polish Succession; the other, the Elector Frederic Augustus of Saxony, who held his own after many contests

until 1733. This occasion was the first on which Russia actively interfered in the Polish disorders. She declared for Frederic Augustus, and helped him to drive out all enemies. After that time the Russian influence in Poland was preponderant. Frederic Augustus II., the son of Augustus the Strong, defeated Stanislaus Lesczynski for the second time, with the help of Russia, in the second War of the Polish Succession, and became the Polish king, Augustus III.; he died in 1763. Similarly the last Polish king, Stanislaus Poniatovski (1764-1795), was a candidate of Russia.

Of this whole series two kings, Stefan Bathori and John Sobieski, stand out conspicuously, and to a lesser degree Vladislav. But while Sobieski, the liberator of Vienna in the year 1683, was merely a military hero, Bathori, a no less able general, distinguished himself by his skilful administration and his statesman-like insight. If anyone could have lifted Poland out of the political and social slough, it would have been Bathori. After he had by his manly attitude defeated the rival candidate, the Emperor Maximilian, who had already taken an oath to the constitution at Vienna, he waged an obstinate struggle with the Slachta about the restrictions dating from the year 1573. He was required to renounce the right of distribution, that is to say, the right to grant imperial offices; these, so soon as they became empty, were to be filled by election in the respective voivodeships. The king then made at the diet of Thorn the famous declaration that he had no intention of being merely a king in a picture.

While he still, as elective candidate, waged war against the imperial party, but especially against Dantzic and other German towns, which took Maximilian's side, Ivan IV. the Terrible conquered almost all Livonia, with the exception of Reval and Riga. Bathori's immediate goal was, therefore, war against Moscow. After he had secured himself against the Turks and Tartars, and had raised a loan from Frederic George, Margrave of Brandenburg-Anspach, he began the war in 1579. In spite of superiority of numbers Ivan's armies were beaten everywhere, and Polock and many other towns and fortresses were captured. Ivan, hard pressed, looked round for help, sent an embassy

THE DECLINE OF POLAND

to the emperor and the Pope, professed that he wished to join the Russian Church closely with the Roman, complained of Bathori's "un-Christian" procedure, and begged for intervention.

Rome was not in a position to resist such tempting prospects. In 1581 the papal legate Antonio Possevino appeared in Poland and went forthwith to Moscow. His conversation with Ivan on religious questions is interesting. Ivan showed himself well read in the Scriptures, perhaps more so than may have been agreeable to the legate; on the whole, he developed such amiable traits that Possevino, doubtless to the amazement of all, styled him a sweet ruler who loved his subjects.

The upshot of the legate's exertions was that Ivan obtained comparatively favourable terms of peace. At Kiverova Horka, in 1582, he merely renounced his claim to Livonia, Polock, and Wielun; he received back the other places which had been conquered by the Poles. The favourable opportunity of subjugating Moscow and proceeding to the conquest of all Eastern Europe had thus been let slip; so, too, the advance of Rome in that quarter was checked.

Once more it was the Slachta which by its shortsightedness and selfishness had hindered the king in the execution of his plans. It haggled with the king over every penny, reproached him for showing favour to Zamojski, a general who had distinguished himself in the war with Moscow, and for his non-fulfilment of the electoral capitulation; always choosing the most unfavourable moment, in order to compel the king the more certainly to comply. Indeed, it forced him into negotiations with Moscow and refused the supplies for the war, so that the king was driven to incur debts with foreign countries. When Ivan died in 1584, Bathori contemplated a renewal of his plans against Turkey, but he died unexpectedly on May 2nd, 1586, at Grodno.

The reign of Stefan Bathori was in many respects profitable to Poland. Not merely was the glory of the Polish arms revived by his martial deeds, the Muscovite lust of conquest quenched for long years to come, and that semi-Asiatic power driven back from the Baltic Sea, but he left other noteworthy traces of his energy. Thus, he devoted his especial attention to the important religious question. It could not escape him that the religious disputes led to no union, crippled the power of society and the realm, and at the same time appreciably checked the development of culture and civic virtues. Starting from this practical standpoint of attention to the general welfare of his country and his subjects, he threw



STEFAN BATHORI: THE FEARLESS
Able alike as a general and as a statesman, Stefan Bathori stands out prominently among the Polish kings. A man of strong will, he left behind many traces of his energy.

himself, though formerly a Protestant, definitely into the Catholic cause, and was thus the first who, with all the means standing at his command, was resolved to carry through the Counter Reformation without giving an exclusively Catholic direction to his policy.

Nevertheless, in his reign the Order of Jesuits gained great influence in Poland. The Jesuits had already moved into Braunsberg in 1565 at the invitation of Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius, the greatest Roman Catholic champion of Poland, and under Henry and Bathori they in-

creased greatly. They founded schools everywhere, and won over the rising generation for their purposes. However successful their pedagogic labours were in many respects, especially in the field of classical philology, they did much to disintegrate the structure of the state, as became evident under the weak successors of Bathori. A particularly favourable light is thrown on Bathori by his friendly feeling towards the peasants. He regarded the patent of nobility merely as a distinction for services to the country, and is said to have raised fifty-five peasants to the peerage. He protected the peasants everywhere; for example, in Livonia against the German

**Peasants
Raised to
the Peerage**

knights, summoned them to military service, and organised a corps of those who were settled on the royal estates—the first regular infantry. Out of every twenty small farmers one was chosen for military service. This corps was called the chosen or farmer corps; it acquitted itself well. He introduced a better organisation into

Bulwark Against the Tartars the imperial militia; he improved the artillery, and created for himself an efficient staff. It was further important that

Bathori completed the organisation of the Cossacks in the Ukraine. Even in the fifteenth century there was in the unclaimed regions on the Dnieper, which had been ravaged by the Turks, a large population, which, fleeing from Poland and Russia to escape intolerable oppression, gradually settled in those parts, and soon did good service as a bulwark of Christianity against the Tartars. It was a vigorous, warlike people, which only needed military organisation to become a formidable power. Bathori now adopted them in the name of the empire, and drew up lists of the able-bodied soldiers, but limited their number of conscripts at first to 600. By this means he obtained new forces for the empire against Russia.

It was a fresh reminder to the Slachta that the laws must be regarded, when Bathori had one of the unruly members beheaded. He held the reins of government with a firm hand. Under his direction a much-needed reform in the judicial system was carried out. He abandoned, indeed, his old right of the last instance, which from various reasons was no longer enforceable; law courts were thus instituted for separate groups of provinces in Lublin, Piotrkov, Wilna, Grodno, and Lutzk. In spite of his high ideals, this king was the object of the meanest attacks. The Slachta accused him of despotic aims and threatened him with deposition. Stefan

Bathori's Successor on the Throne did not allow himself to the very last moment to be deterred from his goal. After the death of Bathori the situation grew worse.

The election of Sigismund III. Vasa and the alliance with Sweden had not proved beneficial to Poland, first, because this house subordinated the newly acquired state to the strict Catholic interests, and secondly, because it only furnished incompetent rulers. Poland was at first by its

new dynasty drawn into the vortex of Swedish troubles. Sigismund and his two sons naturally tried to retain the Swedish crown, their paternal inheritance. But the empire had not the slightest interest in this purely dynastic question, since Sweden had quite other political and economic aims; Protestantism, too, was the state religion there. But the Catholic Church, to whom primarily the election of Sigismund was due, since she thought to bring the Swedes back to her bosom, contrived to interest the realm in the dynasty by the promise which the king made to cede Esthonia to Poland. Supplies were granted to the king for the journey to Sweden. He was crowned there on February 19th, 1594, and subscribed, actually with the knowledge of the papal nuncio, a declaration which excluded the Catholics in Sweden from all offices, while he intended in Poland to exclude the heterodox; so deceitful and dishonourable was the policy that was adopted.

But this was all that Sigismund did in Sweden. His uncle Charles of Südermanland placed himself at the head of the Protestants, drove out the royalists step by step, and was able by the year 1604 to be crowned king under the title of Charles IX. The long war which broke out over this brought Poland, in spite of occasional successes and deeds of valour, to the verge of destruction by the terrible losses and humiliations which it sustained; it ended finally (1660) in the treaty at Oliva with the resignation by the king, John Casimir, of all claims to the crown of Sweden, and with the exhaustion of the Polish empire, which had been obliged to neglect and abandon its most important interests.

It was, further, of the greatest consequence to the empire that Sigismund became the willing ally of the Jesuits. Thus a flood of Catholicism poured into the country, which disregarded religious liberty; a policy that could only create misfortune in Poland, where there was such diversity of creed. The neighbouring powers, shielding religious interests, took, as might be expected, now the Protestants now the Orthodox under their protection, merely in order to interfere in the affairs of the empire. The very first appearance of the king on the scene showed that he was entirely in the hands of the Catholic party. At a hint from Rome he was

THE DECLINE OF POLAND

willing to abdicate the Polish crown in favour of the house of Hapsburg, and himself to retire to Sweden—a proposal which evoked general consternation and ill-feeling. The Jesuits in the interests of the Church negotiated the marriage of the king with Anna, and after her death with Constantia,

Abortive Attempts at Church Union

daughters of the Archduke Charles of Styria and of Mary of Bavaria. The privileges which the Orthodox Church had acquired at the time of the Hussite and Protestant movements were removed, and there was a reversion to the ideas of union as in the palmy days of the papacy.

The attempts at union in 1415 and the Florentine union of 1439 had proved abortive. The Hussite movement and then the Reformation strengthened the Orthodox Greek world in its resistance to the Roman Catholic Church. The union only split up the Russian society into two camps, which fought against each other more bitterly than the Orthodox and the Catholics. A union of the Greek Orthodox Church with Rome is nowadays usually disparaged. The Slavonic liturgy, which would not have been tolerated by Rome, was of inestimable value to all the Slavs; they are indebted to it for their oldest literature.

But, on the other hand, the Orthodox Church, except in the first centuries of its spread among the Slavs, was nowhere an engine of civilisation. It was rather the cause why the Slavs and other nations of the Greek Church remained backward. Their clergy felt that most deeply in places where they lived side by side with the Romans; for this reason the Orthodox bishops were mostly those who first espoused the cause of the union. If some such union had been introduced, with a set purpose and yet in a conciliatory spirit, among the Russo-Polish provinces, the success would have been irresistible. But what the Roman priests now undertook under the spiritual guidance of the Jesuits and the protection of the Polish

king was almost an insult to Christian charity. The majority of Orthodox bishops and the most influential laymen, such as Constantin Ostrogski, were for the union; at their head was Archbishop Michael Rahoza of Kiev.

But the pride of the Catholic prelates, their selfishness and ignorance of the existing conditions, ruined everything. The earlier champions of the union, therefore, drew back, among them the powerful prince Ostrogski. When, besides this, the Patriarchs of Antioch and Constantinople came personally to Poland in order to organise the resistance, only a handful of partisans of the union were left. Both parties met for a final discussion at Brest in 1596. They soon divided into two



THE TOOL OF THE JESUITS

Utterly unfitted for his high position, Sigismund III. Vasa of Sweden, became the puppet of the Jesuits. He was even willing, at a hint from Rome, to abdicate the crown of Poland.

groups, and banned each other; only a few bishops, with the Metropolitan Rahoza and their small following, declared for the union. Two of them, Hypatius Potij, Bishop of Vladimir, and Cyril Terlecki, Bishop of Lutzk, went to Rome with the charter of union, and took the oath of obedience in the name of the whole Russian Church. Thus the famous union of Brest was effected. The Uniate bishops were immediately to receive seats and votes in the Polish Senate. This union brought no gain to the Catholic Church and the Poles in

the future, chiefly because the animosity between the two Russian parties increased and they fought against each other still more obstinately.

At this same time a meeting of the heterodox, or Dissidents, as they were called in Poland, assembled at Thorn to discuss how the swelling tide of Catholic influence might be stemmed. They sent a deputation to the king, but he did not receive it. The union of Brest could not, however, hold its own; for the king and the Slachta did not wish to fulfil the conditions of union. The Uniate bishops were not introduced into the Senate, nor were the privileges of the Church observed; in this way the whole work of

Swelling Tide of Catholic Influence

HARMSWORTH HISTORY OF THE WORLD

union was made ridiculous in the eyes of the non-united Orthodox. The persecution of the Greek Orthodox, who had not joined the union, became more and more severe; they were hindered in their performance of Divine worship; their priests were publicly insulted and outraged; their churches were leased by

**Orthodox
Priests in
Disfavour**

their patrons to Jews, who then demanded money payments for the opening of the churches. Many towns expelled the Orthodox from the town council, and even from the body of citizens. Their churches and church property were taken from them; in a word, the oppression became intolerable. Hatred of Poland increased throughout the East, and the masses were stirred up by the non-united priests. The Cossacks in the Ukraine were especially active, and came forward as protectors of the Orthodox faith. They demanded with threats rights for their metropolitan and their bishops, and for themselves equal rights with the Slachta; but the old respect for the freedom of all had been lost under the influence of the Catholic reaction.

There was no longer any place for the heterodox in Poland. The Orthodox, therefore, organised their forces and attempted to do something for the improvement of culture. Prince Ostrogski founded in Ostrog an academy and a printing-office; presses were started in other places also. The gulf between the two camps, which cleverly strengthened themselves, grew daily wider.

All this was done by Poland in her blind infatuation at a time when some faint prospects in the East were opening out to her. The house of Rurik in Russia was extinct, and Lithuanian magnates placed at that time the pseudo-Demetrius on the throne of the tsar. This Dmitri, about whose real family, in spite of searching investigations, nothing can with certainty be said, was a friend of the Poles

**Threatened
Deposition of
Sigismund**

and of European culture, possibly a Pole himself. There was actually in Poland a party which entertained the plan of deposing Sigismund and offering the Polish crown to Dmitri.

When this plan miscarried, Poland was still offered an opportunity of getting a footing in Russia, since after the deposition of the Tsar Vassili Shuski, the Privy Council in Moscow chose as tsar Vladislav, son of Sigismund. Polish troops under Sholkievski

held Moscow in their power. An agreement was so far made that Vladislav should pledge himself to protect the Greek faith and the Greek Church, to allow the Boyars to retain their privileges, to grant them the Polish privilege of *Neminem Captivabimus*, and to conclude an alliance with Poland. But the narrow-mindedness of the father, who, probably at the instigation of the Church and the Jesuits, wished to acquire the crown of Russia for himself, and the rebellion of the Zebrzydowski family, which broke out at the most critical moment, frustrated all the great plans regarding a union with Moscow once and for ever.

When Russia, therefore, was being consolidated at home under the new Romanof dynasty, Poland and Russia once more faced each other with the old hostility. Poland resolved on war in order to bring Vladislav to Moscow by force of arms; but at the same time the folly was committed of binding the king even then to incorporate any future conquests with the Polish crown. Vladislav was forced in the year 1617 solemnly to resign Smolensk, Starodub, and a series of other countries in favour of the Polish crown, as if this resignation of Russian provinces would be a recommendation to the Polish candidates in Russia.

For the favourable peace at Deulino near the Troizkaja Lawra (1618), which secured to them Smolensk, Dorogobush, Czernigov, and several other towns, the Poles are indebted to the Cossack Hetman Konaszevich, who came to their help with 20,000 picked troops and enabled them to march on Moscow, as well as to the pacific nature of the Tsar Michael Romanof and the Russian desire for tranquility. Soon afterwards Poland was entangled in a war with the famous Swedish warrior Gustavus Adolphus, and with Turkey, which cost her great sacrifices, in spite of the heroic deeds of the generals Stanislaus Koniecpolski and Chodkievich. The Cossacks, who since 1596 had already come forward openly as protectors of the Orthodox faith, now assumed a menacing attitude.

The Slachta, when it met after the death of Sigismund in 1632 to elect his son Vladislav IV. Sigismund, who died in 1648, restricted still more the power of the crown. The king was in the future not to be allowed to begin a war without the

THE DECLINE OF POLAND

consent of the imperial diet, or to enlist soldiers out of his privy purse; he was required to confer the vacant offices within six weeks after the diet, to cede to the country the profits of coinage, to build a fleet on the Baltic, and to contribute two quarters instead of one quarter of the royal revenues to the war with Moscow. Besides this, the old tax of two groschen from the hide of land was abolished as "a survival of the old serfdom."

The King's Restricted Liberty

According to these provisos the king was more restricted in his liberty than the ordinary noble, since the latter might keep troops; Zamojski Wisneovecki and others were able to put 10,000 men into the field. Vladislav was compelled to accept these stipulations, and in the course of his reign had to submit to still further curtailment of his freedom. As he once went to Baden to take the waters, the diet of 1639 passed a resolution that the king could not leave the country without the consent of parliament. Later the king was prohibited, and this time with more justice, from incurring debts in imperial affairs.

Vladislav was obviously forced to try and improve this untenable position of the crown in regard to the estates, and to strengthen the central power. His whole reign is a covert struggle against the existing constitution. Above all, he wished to withdraw himself from the excessive influence of the Catholic Church, which he judged harmful to the welfare of the country. The Church, dominated by Jesuits, encouraged men to enter their community, conceded no privileges to the Uniates, and thus rendered the whole work of the union void. The Jesuits in Poland, as in other countries, searched for Protestant and other heretical books and destroyed them. The schools came gradually into their hands; they founded their own academy in Cracow, in order to enter into rivalry with the one already existing. They accumulated immense

fortunes, and finally watched every step which the king took.

Vladislav, who in May, 1624, at his father's instructions, had undertaken a long journey to several courts, and finally to Rome, at last ventured to take up a bold attitude against the predominance of the Church. He, like Casimir IV. previously, endeavoured to make the influence of the crown felt in the election of the bishops, and negotiated with Rome on the subject with some success. He wished that the papal consent to the founding of the Jesuit academy in Cracow should be recalled. He instituted in Thorn, certainly to the indignation of the Catholics, a discussion between the different confessions, which, however, like others previously,

remained unsuccessful. He protected the non-united, and, disregarding the union at Brest, left them their own bishoprics in Lemberg, Premysl, Lutzk, Mohilev, and the archbishopric of Kiev, without troubling himself about the protest of Rome; in fact, he actually permitted the return of Uniates to Orthodoxy and treated the Greek Orthodox with justice. The success of his exertions was considerable. In consequence of this the eastern provinces, and, above all, the Cossacks, the champions of Orthodoxy, remained true to the



A KING WITHOUT LIBERTY

The liberty of the crown was curtailed during the reign of Vladislav IV. The diet of 1639 passed a resolution that the king could not leave the country without the consent of parliament.

king, although they were aware that they could not expect any just treatment from their enemy the Slachta.

In an equally decisive manner he broke away from the foreign policy of his father. He strove for an alliance of Poland with Russia, carried on war with great energy, and obtained in 1634 at Poljanovka a favourable peace, which brought to the Poles the possession of Sievsk, Smolensk and Czernigov. His intention was now to wage a joint war on a grand scale against Turkey; he therefore yielded in the Swedish question, and in the truce at Stuhmsdorf on September 12th, 1635, in return for the restoration of Prussia,

Foreign Policy of Vladislav

renounced all claim to Livonia, which was conquered by Sweden. In his eagerness to attain his purpose he made overtures to the house of Hapsburg, and married Cecilia Renata, an Austrian archduchess. When on her death he married a French princess—Marie Louise of Nevers-Gonzaga—he did so probably in order to fit out troops against Turkey with her money.

Social Revolution in Poland

If Poland then achieved successes, she owed them only to the circumspection and self-sacrifice of her king. In return she was not even willing to pay the debts incurred by him in the war against Moscow, and after great efforts a tax was granted the king only as "gratitude." In one single point did the king allow himself to be carried away by the Slachta to take a step momentous for Poland, in the legislation concerning the Cossacks.

At the close of the sixteenth century a great economic and social revolution had been completed in Poland. The colonisation of the eastern provinces had made unexpected progress. Red Russia, Volhynia and Podolia had been long occupied by the Polish lords; now the stream of colonists flowed into the Dnieper region and swept along with it the inhabitants of the above-named regions. Even nobles who, in consequence of the civil wars and also of the struggle with Russia, were at the end of their economic resources, marched under the protection of mighty lords to the eastern provinces, and there became Cossacks. Small landowners in the western provinces could not hold their own from want of hands; equally in the east the uncertainty and the exhausting work of colonisation rendered the development of small farms impossible.

The consequence was that the petty nobility, especially in the east, became dependent on the large landowners; by this step their influence in national life would naturally sink, while that of the magnates rose. If in the fifteenth and also in the sixteenth century the petty nobles had exercised such power in the state that they could pass even the great legislative Revision, and if the constitution had stood under

the banner of democracy, the centre of gravity was now shifted once more to the Senate, which, by economic pressure, ruled the chamber of provincial deputies.

The development of Poland from the close of the sixteenth century lay, therefore, in the hands of the magnates; the oligarchs dictated to the crown; with them originated the first of those revolts so disastrous to the state, which were destined to lead irresistibly to the downfall of Poland. Side by side with the formation of the large landed estates in the eastern provinces went a movement of the population from west to east, which shifted the economic and also the political centre of gravity of the empire toward the eastern frontier. The great nobles of the east guided the state according to their own will.

In addition to this a social transformation took place. Among the Cossacks a party was slowly developing which aimed at freedom and wished to be on equality with the nobles. But nothing was more dangerous for the great landowners of the eastern marches than this movement, by which they ran the risk of losing the whole peasantry, the one support of their farms. All who were oppressed and wished to live a life of freedom joined the Cossacks. The

Cossacks on the Increase peasant population could only be held back by force from running away and migrating to the Ukraine. The number of the Cossacks increased from year to year with great rapidity. To remedy this evil, measures were taken that only 600 Cossacks should be admitted, and registers were drawn up for inspection, while all others had to remain peasants.

The threatened oligarchs now thought of applying an efficient remedy. At their instigation the diet of 1638 resolved to place the registered persons under a Polish commissary; all who later acquired privileges were to forfeit their rights, liberties and incomes. Their possessions were confiscated by the lords, and they must immediately pay

taxes on them. This resolution of the diet kindled a revolt of the Cossacks which was destined in the end to result in the loss of the Ukraine.





GREAT DAYS OF COSSACK POWER AND THE COMING UP OF RUSSIA

AFTER the conquest of Kiev and the subjugation of Russia by the Tartars, Moscow on the one hand, and Lithuania on the other, had grown into new political centres. But in Kiev all culture and political life were dying out. The country gradually became a desert; the survivors left by the sword of the Tartar were dragged away into captivity or emigrated, while a few who remained behind, living in perpetual danger, sank into barbarism and took refuge in the forests and fens. It was only when these districts were conquered by Lithuanian princes that the fugitives came back and the country was once more populated. Princes of the Olgerd stock received large tracts of this unowned land and introduced settlers. Their primary duty was always, however, to ward off Tartar attacks, and the military organisation had therefore first to be taken in hand. Thus, in course of time a kind of military frontier against the Tartars was developed. The first step was taken by the frontier starosties (districts governed by starosts); the resident landowners also fought the Tartars on their own account. Owing to this duty of defence, free companies were formed, which stood in very loose relations with their princes and starosts. At the beginning of the fifteenth century they bore the name of Cossacks.

The whole institution, like the name, is of Tartar origin; but the Slavonic Cossacks developed quite differently. In any case, a direct connection with the Kirghiz, who call themselves Kasaks, is not demonstrable. It is also better to separate them entirely from the Casoges on the peninsula of Taman, and the Tcherkesses in the Caucasus, who were subjugated in 965 by Sviatoslav. Among the Tartars those persons were called Cossacks who made raiding expeditions without the permission of their chiefs. Russian and Lithuanian princes, such as Vasilij IV. Ivanovitch and Sigismund I., made formal complaint to the Tartar khans that the "Cossacks"

invaded their territories. In Russia people were originally called Cossacks who, in contrast to the settled population with their burden of taxes, were engaged in trade and commerce, exporting salt in particular, or served on board the shipping on the Volga, or were occupied with fisheries on the Dnieper and brought fish

to the market at Kiev—people, in short, who were not fettered to the soil. But by the beginning of the sixteenth century there were Cossacks whose duties were exclusively military, although they were not free, but were the subjects of various princes. They must have been the descendants of those free itinerant traders who must have been familiarised with every sort of danger on their journeys. Citizens and peasants who found their burdens intolerable flocked to them. These Cossack bands often bore the names of their lords; thus we find "Cossacks of Prince Demetrius Wisnioviecki," or, according to the names of the starosties and towns, Cossacks of Kanew, Bar, Winnica, Bilacerkov and Kiev, of Smolensk, Riasan and Putvol. Those of Czerkasy were so renowned that the Cossacks were later called generally Czerkasy. The greatest services in the organisation and development of the Cossack system were performed by the frontier starosts and by the princes.

Daszkovicz, Starost of Czerkasy on the Dnieper, went to Poland and demanded in the diet at Piotrkov that these free companies should be recognised as an imperial army, whose duty was to guard the frontier; he showed also how important that might be for the empire. His request was not granted; and when the government proposed to restrict the Cossack right of settlement they withdrew behind the rapids south of Czerkasy. Here the free Cossack race, which recognised no sovereign, made its home. We find the first traces of these "Saporoska Sjetsch" in an edict of King Sigismund

Augustus of 1568. They are more precisely described to us in the documents of the end of the sixteenth century. Their strongholds were the islands in the Dnieper, where they had their forts.

Their organisation was that of the orders of chivalry in Western Europe. Implicit obedience, piety, chastity in the camp, absolute equality—these were the conditions of life among the Sjetsch. The assembly was the only authority; it elected the chief, the Ataman or Hetman, who held his office only for one year, and then was brought to account for his actions, and could even be punished by death; the Asavul, or second in command, and a chancellor (pisar). The assembly possessed also the only judicial authority. Quarrels were strictly forbidden; theft and the plundering of Christians were punishable by hanging. The Sjetsch lived according to the precepts of the Orthodox Church and strictly observed the fasts.

Their most honourable task was war against the infidels. They lived in fenced enclosures (kurenj) which were covered with horse-skins, 150 in each. Married men could be received into the company, but their wives might not be brought with them. Their food was a sort of yeast, fish, and fish-soup. A new institution thus began to flourish in those parts; indeed, it seemed as if a new state would spring up there, on a new non-European basis. While in Poland and the rest of Europe the freedom of individual classes alone was known and preserved, there the very lowest stratum demanded for itself the same freedom; there was to be there no class distinction, but merely a free nation.

Independently of the Sjetsch, free companies also were formed which, when they planned a raid, chose a Hetman for themselves. But everything later was concentrated in the Sjetsch, which formed the rallying point of all the Cossacks of the

Ukraine. So far as we know, the noble John Badovskij was elected Hetman over all the Cossacks for the first time under Sigismund Augustus in 1572. The same king put all the Cossacks under the jurisdiction of one judge, who had his residence at Bilacerkov. After this time captains, or Hetmans, who were recognised by the Polish government appeared at their head. The Cossack life possessed an irresistible charm; and when the news spread of

this fairyland where every man could live as free as a bird, and it received a solemn consecration as a sworn foe to the infidels, it was gradually populated with fugitives and deserters from Poland and Russia. The country on both sides of the Dnieper round Kiev, as far as the Tartar frontier, became a paradise for all the poor and the oppressed, not less than for those who thirsted for glory and feats of arms. The Little Russian race seemed qualified to put into practice the idea of universal equality and freedom. The science of war was here brought to high perfection. At the same time a literature was produced which glorified the Cossack life in attractive ballads and tales. All the Slavonic world might well be proud of this free state. Of course this people, which regarded war as the object of life, could not fairly be expected to cultivate a higher civilisation.

The Cossacks might have brought incalculable advantages to the country and the whole empire of Poland if the Poles had understood how to fit this new member into the organism of the state. But the democratic spirit of the Cossacks did not harmonise with the aristocratic constitution of Poland. There were in Poland after the Union of Lublin (1569) only three sharply divided classes—the Slachta, the citizens, and the present serfs. There was no place for the Cossacks among these three classes, and, instead of any advantages, the Cossacks therefore presented to Poland a social and political problem, as important as it was dangerous, which in its subsequent shape became predominantly an economic question.

The Cossacks exercised on the peasantry in Poland and Lithuania such a strong attraction that only the severest penalties could restrain the people from fleeing by crowds into the Ukraine. They seemed, therefore, to the Slachta to be a revolutionary influence which disturbed the order of the state, and, by encouraging the exodus of the labouring country population, threatened every farm with desolation and ruin. But the economic stability of the Polish state depended on the serfdom of the country population; this had been a main object of the legislature, just as in the ancient world the prosperity of the state had depended on slavery as a legal institution. It is therefore intelligible why the Slachta persecuted with deadly



CHARACTERISTIC PORTRAITS OF THE FIGHTING COSSACKS

1, Cossack officer; 2, 3, 4, and 5, Typical Cossacks soldiers of the Caucasus; 6, Cossacks of the Don.

hatred and deep contempt those runaway peasants who ventured to put themselves on a level with their betters. They staked everything on reducing the Cossacks again to the position of peasants. The division of interests was not to be healed, and war was inevitable. It was an almost hopeless task to find a means of arranging the dispute and solving the social problem.

Apart from Sigismund I., who had quietly promoted the organisation of the Cossacks, Sigismund Augustus was the first who attempted to link the Cossack element with the organism of the Polish state, since he placed them under the authority of the starosts, restricted their numbers, and fixed their pay. Bathori had only taken in his pay 600 Cossacks, and those for the war against Moscow. It was only under Sigismund III. that the diet of 1590 determined to pay 6,000 Cossacks. They were entered upon a list and called "registered." Their commander-in-chief was the Polish Crown Hetman for the time being, so that the Cossacks were intended to compose only a part of the Polish army. The "registered" received grants of land, a court of justice of their own at Baturin, and the right of electing superior officers. All the others, by far the majority, were intended to revert to the status of peasants. Sigismund thus found a way out of the difficulty which only satisfied a very small proportion of the Cossacks. But the Slachta did not wish to admit even these 6,000 into the state, and treated them merely as mercenaries. This provoked new strife. The "registered" combined with the non-registered Cossacks and rebelled against the government, attacked the Slachta on their estates, and, under leaders of their own choice, made raids upon Turkey and the Tartar territory. Through this

state of affairs a new difficulty sprang up for the Polish government; for this arrogance of the Cossacks threatened every moment to bring on their heads a dangerous war with the Porte, and injured Ottomans were continually lodging complaints against insolent Cossacks. All commands were as useless as the execution of several Hetmans. What did the free Cossacks care about the national interests of Poland? They loved liberty and war above everything else;

they went as gaily to battle as to a dance. Often imitating the intrepid Varangians, they sailed in their light craft from the Dnieper to the Black Sea and plundered the suburbs of Constantinople or the towns of Kilia, Akerman, Ismail, Sinope and others. Sigismund built the fortress of Kremenczug on the Dnieper in 1591 to hold 1,000 men, whose task it would be to keep the Cossacks in check. But even these standing garrisons were unable to restore order. In the year 1592 the first revolt of the registered Cossacks broke out, under the leadership of the Hetman Christopher Kosinski. Prince Constantine Ostrogski, himself Orthodox, suppressed it at the head of the Slachta. The Cossacks were forced to surrender Kosinski and elect another Hetman, to give up the booty, and to bind themselves not to undertake any raids without the knowledge and consent of the government,

and not to receive any deserters. But a second rising followed in 1596, under Loboda and Severin Nalivajko.

The first revolt may have had a more social character, but now there was a religious element added, since the Cossacks rose to protect the Orthodox faith, which was threatened by the union of Brest in 1596. Ostrogski, the antagonist of the union, now himself fanned the flame, since he wished to wreak vengeance on



ANCIENT COSSACK CHAIN MAIL
Present-day Cossack in the armour of the past.



GIRLS OF THE KUBAN COSSACKS, SHOWING THEIR DIFFERENT HEADGEARS



A KUBAN COSSACK WITH HIS WIFE AND DAUGHTER, AND A KUBAN GIRL

FAMILIAR TYPES OF THE KUBAN COSSACKS

Alexander Siemaszko, the castellan of Braclaw, and on the Bishop Cyryl Terlecki. The rebels assembled in his territory; they were joined in Ostrog by Damian Nalivajko, a brother of Severin, the chaplain of Ostrogski; many nobles, even the non-registered, took their side. The best generals, Zamojski and Sholkievski, were

**Turkish Fleet
Burned
by Cossacks**

sent against the insurgents and forced them to surrender. The two Hetmans were given up and were beheaded at Warsaw. Treated with great harshness, the Cossacks now fled in masses to the left bank of the Dnieper, to Saporoshye, where they established their headquarters. Their numbers grew so rapidly there that they were able once more to undertake raids; they surprised Varna in 1605, and destroyed, in 1607, Oczakov and Perekop.

The Saporogi became especially formidable when the Hetman Peter Konaszevich Sahajdacznyi, a bold and skilful strategist, placed himself at their head in 1612. He plundered, in 1612, the coast of the Crimea as far as Eupatoria, took Kaffa, destroyed Sinope in 1613, pillaged in 1614 the coast of Asia Minor, and in 1615-1616 Trebizond, and burnt the Turkish fleet. It was he who supported the Polish campaign against Moscow. The name of Saporogi was soon universally used for the Dnieper Cossacks. Konaszevich assumed the title "Hetman of both banks of the Dnieper and of the Saporogi," and placed himself over the "registered"; in fact, he entered into alliance with the tsar and with Turkey.

He was the first Hetman who openly protected the Church and organised it, since he demanded an Orthodox Metropolitan with suffragan bishops for Kiev, and carried his point. The Patriarch of Jerusalem, Theophan, came to Russia and consecrated Jov Borecki as Metropolitan and six other bishops; Konaszevich assigned them estates. He founded many churches, renewed the monasteries, opened schools, and was thus the first who laid stress on the improvement of culture. He also called upon the Polish government to confirm his position; this was done when his help was required against the Turks.

But he was always endeavouring to emphasise his independence. When Poland, in the treaty with Turkey of 1621, promised to keep the Cossacks in check,

he immediately organised an expedition into the Turkish territory, by way of registering his protest against that stipulation. Strangely enough, this man of iron, who, for instance, ordered the Hetman of the "registered" Borodovka to be beheaded in sight of the Polish camp, and seemed to love war and war only, retired after the battle of Khotin, where he was wounded in the hand, into a monastery, and there occupied himself with the composition of a book, to which even his enemies gave unstinted praise. Konaszevich died on April 5th, 1622, an extraordinary character, bold to foolhardiness, a clever statesman, a patron of culture and freedom; in short, one of the greatest Slavs in history. He founded the national independence and spread abroad the fame of his native Ukraine; among the Cossacks themselves he roused a deep love for the mother-country. He is still celebrated in song.

In three years after his death the Cossack country sank from the pinnacle to which it had been raised by Konaszevich. The Cossacks had been welcomed everywhere as mercenaries; Loboda and Nalivajko had fought under the emperor's banner in Transylvania, and others, like Lisovski, in Germany itself. The Polish government now sent the Hetman Koniecpolski

**Decline of
Cossack
Independence**

to the Ukraine, on the right bank, under the pretext of preventing Cossack inroads into Turkish territory. The Cossacks were unexpectedly surrounded by his forces on Lake Kurakov, misled by false promises, and compelled to surrender. They were forced to accept the following terms on the heath of Medveshi Lozy in 1625. Six thousand "registered" were to be retained, 60,000 gulden in gold paid to them, and the register kept in the imperial treasury; the Hetman was to be confirmed in his appointment by the Polish Crown Hetman; inroads into Turkish territory were to be discontinued; the boats were to be burnt and no new ones built. A thousand of the registered Cossacks were to be on garrison duty in the country of the Saporogi.

The non-registered were to serve their lords and sell their goods within twelve weeks. Michael Doroszenko was then chosen Hetman, and confirmed in his post by Koniecpolski. Some years afterwards a Polish army came again into the Ukraine, and under its protection the Slachta indulged in acts of the greatest injustice and

THE GREAT DAYS OF COSSACK POWER

violence. Murders, outrages, and confiscation of property were the order of the day. If we reflect that hardly one in twenty could be entered on the register, we shall realise how great a mass of inflammable material was collected there. There was equal danger seething among the Saporogi, who had their own Hetmans.

On the election of Vladislav IV., the representatives of the Cossacks also appeared in the imperial diet. They asked for electoral rights, abolition of the union, increase in the numbers of the registered, and the confirmation of the privileges of the Orthodox Church. They received the answer that the Cossacks certainly formed part of the body of the Polish republic, but only as the hair and nails, which could be cut off. In order to emphasise his demands, Petryzcky, Hetman of the "registered," marched to Volhynia and ravaged the property of the Slachta. The Cossacks were not admitted to full electoral privileges; but the rights of the Orthodox Church were confirmed and its Metropolitan, Peter Mogila, was recognised. Vladislav IV. promised to restore the Orthodox dioceses

Cossack Leaders Beheaded and to found new dioceses for the Uniates, and allowed them to build some churches and to set up printing-presses.

But there was little talk of the freedom of the Cossacks; on the contrary, he ordered the new fortress of Kudak to be built on the Dnieper, which was intended to keep the Saporogi in check. The Hetman Sulyma destroyed this fortress, for which act he was impaled in Warsaw and an army was sent against the Cossacks; these, under Pawluk, who already contemplated the autonomy of the Ukraine, were ready for a desperate resistance. The Cossacks fought fiercely at Kumejki and Borovitza, but were forced to give in. Pawluk, Tomilenko, and other leaders were beheaded.

The Cossacks had to ask for pardon; all who went to Saporoshje were to be sent back to their lords. The preparation of the register was for the future entrusted to the royal commissaries, and the people were robbed of their goods. The diet of 1638, rendered arrogant by its last victory, now had recourse to the severest measures. The "registered" were put on a level with the peasants, declared to have forfeited all rights, and deprived of their goods. Henceforward the Polish commis-

sary resided in Tréchtémirov. The Polish armies encamped in the Ukraine and mercilessly wasted the country.

But people were much deceived in Poland who expected that the Ukraine would be finally pacified by the enslavement of the Cossacks. As an answer to the resolutions of the diet a new revolt broke out under Hunia, Ostrjanycia and Filonenko. But this also was suppressed. In a camp which had surrendered unconditionally every single person was massacred. Among the Polish magnates who took the greatest interest in the enslavement of the Ukraine, Jeremias Wisnioviecki—a voivode of the Jagellon stock—distinguished himself by his barbarity; at the head of his own troops he burnt, beheaded, impaled, or blinded all the Cossacks who fell in to his hands.

The rebellion was crushed by the weight of numbers. Many fled to Saporoshje and wandered about in the steppe. The idea of gaining support from some foreign power now gathered strength. Ostrjanycia and Filonenko went to Moscow; some 6,000 are said to have entered the service of Persia. The Slachta now ruled absolutely in the Ukraine; the Cossacks were forbidden even to fish and to hunt. The Jesuits, too, came there before long. Many magnates, such as Wisnioviecki, Konicepolski, Kalinovski, Potocki, acquired huge tracts of land. The district which Wisnioviecki now possessed was greater in size than many a German principality. A deputation of the Cossacks—Roman Polovetz, Bogdan Chmelnicki, Ivan Bojaryn, Ivan Wolezenko—which demanded from the king the restoration of freedom, of the right to own property, and of payment for service, could not effect anything. There was tranquillity in the Ukraine only for ten years; it seemed as if the country only wished to try to what limits the oppression of the Polish Slachta could go. To this period belong the meritorious exertions of the famous Metropolitan of Kiev, Peter Mogila. The family of Mogila gave some able rulers to the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia; it was connected by many matrimonial ties with the foremost families of Poland. Peter received his education partly in the school of the Stauropegian fraternity at Lemberg, which was intimate with his family, and

Terrible Fall of the Cossacks

Ten Years' Tranquillity in the Ukraine

partly abroad. In 1625 he entered the most celebrated monastery of Russia, the Peczerskaja Lavra at Kiev, of which he became abbot at the end of 1627. In this capacity he went in 1632, at the head of the Cossack deputation to Poland, to the Reichstag, and petitioned the king to grant rights to the Orthodox Church.

The Famous Metropolitan Peter Mogila The consecration of Jov Borecki as Metropolitan of Kiev by the Patriarch Theophan of Jerusalem, at the request of the Hetman Konaszevich, had taken place without the king's knowledge; the office of metropolitan and certain bishoprics were now intended to be recognised by the state. After the death of Borecki, Peter Mogila was recognised as Metropolitan in 1632.

Mogila's first and important task was the improvement of secondary and elementary schools. While the Catholic priests, the Jesuits in particular, founded and supported scientific institutions on every side in order to fight the Evangelicals with spiritual weapons, the Russian clergy at the period of the Tartar dominion had sunk very low. The majority of the priests were illiterate. Even the most bigoted supporters of Orthodoxy could not fail to see that, if they wished to save their Church, they ought not to neglect culture any further. Ecclesiastical brotherhoods were founded, and printing-presses and schools were set up for the protection of the Church in the most important sees, such as Lemberg, Kiev, Luck, Wilna.

The first Orthodox school with a press was founded in 1580 by Prince Constantine Ostrogski in his town of Ostrog. A school with a press was next founded in 1586 at Lemberg by the Stauropigian fraternity; another in 1588 at Wilna, when the Patriarch of Constantinople stayed there; a third in Luck, in 1589; a fourth in Kiev. Books in defence of their Church now began to be published by the

Education Spreads in Spite of Persecution Orthodox party. The danger was the greater since King Sigismund III., an enthusiastic Catholic and patron of the Jesuits, aimed at the extirpation of the Church and schools of the Orthodox party. When Theophan, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, appeared, he was announced to be a Turkish spy, and the bishops consecrated by him were brought before the courts. In spite of all this they held their own, and the schools increased in

number. Mogila was especially desirous of founding in Kiev a university, like those of other countries, in which instruction could be given in Latin, Greek, and Polish. He sent young persons abroad for some years to study the higher branches of education, and then installed them as professors in his school, which bore the name of a "college," and was subsequently raised to the rank of a university. He sacrificed all his property to this end. He was soon in a position to send exemplary monks and efficient teachers to the Prince of Wallachia and to Moscow.

A vigorous intellectual movement now began. An apologetic Orthodox literature appeared; the Greeks could now vie successfully with the Roman Catholics. The school had good teachers, and it educated famous scholars. Mogila himself was conspicuously active in the literary field. He wrote a series of the most necessary church books for the people and for teachers, amended the text of the translation of the Bible, and composed apologetics, especially the "Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East" (the Confessio

An Age of Intellectual Activity Orthodoxa of 1643). Russia was able for centuries to find sustenance in the intellectual products of this man and his school. In the year 1640, Peter Mogila proposed to the Tsar Michael to found a monastery with a school under the direction of Little Russian monks, in which the instruction should be given in the Greek and Slavonic languages. Two of the learned Kievans, Epifanij Slavinckij, at the recommendation of the Patriarch Nikon, and Simeon Polockij, entered into closer relations with the Tsar Alexis.

Polockij in particular was both a prominent preacher and a poet, whose dramas were produced at court; he was also (after 1670) manager of the royal printing establishment. He it was who drafted the first scheme for a university in Moscow with faculties in Slavonic, Greek and Latin—a magnificent conception, which can be traced back to Mogila himself. The sons of Alexis, Feodor and Ivan were patrons of the Kievan scholars. Peter the Great invited the teachers of this school to his court, and formed out of them a staff of savants, to whom he confided the intellectual regeneration of Russia. The pupils of the Kievan school



ENTRANCE TO THE PALACE OF THE KHANS AT BAKHTCHI-SARAI



PALACE AT ALOUPKA AND TOMBS OF THE KHANS AT BAKHTCHI-SARAI



IN THE GARDEN OF THE PALACE AT ALOUPKA
IN THE CRIMEA : SCENES IN THE LAND OF THE TARTAR KHANS

bore the torch of culture everywhere, and filled the highest offices in the Church.

Mogila died in 1647, barely fifty years old, worn out by his restless energy. As Konaszevich aroused the pride and the independence of the inhabitants of Southern Russia, so Mogila, a kindred spirit, awakened the culture of the Ukraine, covered it with the glory of science, and promoted the self-consciousness of the Orthodox Church. It must be confessed that even thus the old defects of the Greek Church could no longer be made good; the richest and most conspicuous families, to whom nearly half the Ukraine on the left bank belonged, gradually went over to the Catholic Church. Almost the only adherents of the Orthodox faith were the poor, and in the towns the few citizens who were persuaded by spiritual brotherhood to continue in the Eastern Church. In the year of Mogila's death there was already great excitement in the Ukraine, and at the beginning of 1648 the Cossacks defeated a Polish army. This time Bogdan Sinovi Chmelnicki, son of a Sotnik from Tchigirin, had placed himself at the head of the insurgents. He had studied in the Collegium Mogilanum and then in the Jesuit school at Jaroslav, and had the reputation of being a well-read man. He fought in the Polish army at the battle of Cecora, where his father fell; he himself was taken prisoner and detained for two years in Constantinople. There he learnt the Turkish habits and language, a knowledge which proved very useful to him. Returning home on the conclusion of peace he went, discontented, to the Cossacks, shared in all their revolts, and was nominated chancellor (pisar) by them.

His was a kindly, peaceable nature; it would never have occurred to him to stir up a rebellion had not the arrogance of the Polish Slachta and the prevailing anarchy in Poland driven him to it. His estate of Sobotovo was taken from him (he was not a noble) by the understarost Czaplinsky; his wife was carried

off, his son killed, and when he demanded justice he, like all other injured persons before him, failed to find it. He then turned to the king. The latter had then received humiliation upon humiliation from the Slachta; there was reluctance to pay even his war debts, and his personal liberty was restricted; as just at this time his only son had died, his sorrow knew no bounds and his temper was greatly excited. He is said to have hinted to the Cossack who now lodged his grievance before him that he had a sword with which he could procure justice for himself. In any case, there is little doubt that Vladislav gave some encouragement to the Cossack; the whole subsequent attitude of Chmelnicki shows it. On the



A GREAT REBEL LEADER

Bogdan Sinovi Chmelnicki revealed his qualities as a leader, overcoming the Polish forces at Shovti and again at Korsun. There was great rejoicing—the pealing of bells and the thunder of cannon—when he entered Kiev.

way back from Warsaw Chmelnicki stopped in every village, complained everywhere at the injustice done to him, and asked if the people were ready to take up arms against the Poles; all were only waiting for the right moment. Having reached the Ukraine, he took counsel in the forest with his friends who had grown grey in campaigns; they all thought that no help could be looked for except from themselves. An order for his arrest was issued, but he escaped to Saporoshje (towards the end of 1647). After having secured the assistance of the Cossacks in an assembly, he went to the

Tartars to ask their help. His proceeding got wind in Poland, and at the beginning of 1648 two army corps were sent to the Ukraine, one overland, the other down the Dnieper; in the latter were embodied the "registered" under the Hetman Barabasz. Chmelnicki advanced to meet them, and when they came to shore they went over to him.

Chmelnicki called on them to protect their life and liberty, their wives and children; a shout of joy greeted his words; Barabasz was thrown into the river. Thus the Ukraine on both sides of the Dnieper was in a blaze. The clergy preached the war everywhere and encouraged the revolt. But the feeling was intense enough

THE GREAT DAYS OF COSSACK POWER

without this. Not merely the people in the Ukraine, but also those of Red Russia, and even the country folk in the western provinces of Poland, rose up and helped the Cossacks. If they murdered the Slachta and the Catholic clergy, pillaged their property and burnt their churches, they only requited them for what they themselves had already suffered. Every discontented spirit hurried into Chmelnicki's camp, knowing well that the hour of reckoning was at hand.

Chmelnicki soon defeated one Polish army at Shovti Wody, another at Korsunj. At the news of this Vladislav IV. started to go to the Ukraine, but died on the way, at Merecz, on March 20th, 1648. Another large army was put in the field, but this, being surrounded on the River Pilavka, took to flight under cover of darkness, and the whole rich camp fell into the hands of the Cossacks. Confusion and perplexity now prevailed in Poland. The Cossacks wished to be led to Warsaw. But Chmelnicki hesitated, probably because there was no reliance to be placed on the Tartars. He only marched to Red Russia, besieged Lemberg, took 200,000 gulden as ransom, invested Zamosc, received there 20,000 gulden, and awaited the result of the royal election. His embassy worked for the election of John Casimir, brother of Vladislav, who was eventually elected.

Chmelnicki now began his homeward march; and made his entry amid the pealing of bells and the thunder of cannon into Kiev, where he was solemnly received by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, by the metropolitan, the clergy, and the citizens. There now appeared in his camp ambassadors of the sultan from Moldavia and Wallachia, from Transylvania and Moscow, all with offers of alliance. Chmelnicki played the part of an independent sovereign. Ambassadors also came from the newly elected king, at their head Kisiel, an Orthodox noble. But Chmelnicki rejected all proposals for peace, and marched for the second time to the Polish frontier, since he knew that only the sword could decide.

The king in person now took the field against him. A battle was fought at Zborov. John Casimir had almost been taken prisoner when Chmelnicki gave orders for the slaughter to cease; he wished, he said, to extirpate the Slachta, but not to fight against the king. New

terms of peace were put forward by him. He demanded that 40,000 should be put on the list of the "reserved," and that the voivode ships of Kiev, Tchernygov, Poltava, and Podolia, should be given to the Cossacks; abolition of the union of Brest, a seat for the Orthodox Metropolitan in the Polish Senate, and the expulsion of the Jesuits and the Jews from the Ukraine. Poland would not listen to these conditions, and preparations were renewed for war. The people now began to mutter that Chmelnicki was deserting them and would not win freedom for them. But this time the Cossacks, although Chmelnicki is said to have had 350,000 men with him, were beaten at Beresteczko in Volhynia, through the treachery of the Tartar Khan, who, having made an agreement with the king, left the field of battle at the decisive moment and carried off with him as prisoner Chmelnicki, vainly urging him to turn back. The latter regained his liberty after much trouble, and when he came back all was lost. He still persevered, indeed, and even won some victories; but he saw that the country could not hold its own without foreign aid. At the assembly specially convened for the purpose some declared for Turkey, others for Moscow; there were a few voices in favour of remaining with Poland. The masses were for Russia, with which the common faith formed a link. Chmelnicki himself preferred Russia. He sent in 1653 a solemn embassy to the Tsar Alexis, who had hitherto maintained an unfriendly attitude toward the insurgents, and this time the Grand Duke decided to accept the Cossacks. In the next year Muscovite commissaries appeared in the Ukraine and took possession of the country. An army under Doroszenko submitted some years later to Turkey. In the centuries of struggle between Poland and Russia for the sovereignty in the East, the year 1654 forms the turning point. Poland had been driven into the background by her own fault, while the power of Russia was from year to year extended at the expense of Poland. It might now be said that the game was lost for Poland.

Russia in the Ukraine

Poland Driven Into the Background

But the democratic Cossack community was as little adapted for the arrogant Muscovites as for the aristocratic Polish republic. Absolutism cannot brook



THE GREAT ADVENTURE OF MAZEPPA, PRINCE OF THE UKRAINE

Born of a noble family in Podolia, Mazeppa became a page in the court of the King of Poland, and there he is said to have intrigued with the wife of a Podolian count. For this offence the young page was lashed to a wild horse and turned adrift. The horse dropped dead in the Ukraine, where Mazeppa was released by a Cossack family, who nursed him in their own hut. He subsequently became a great leader, and in the Northern War of 1707 made a bold effort to free the Ukraine. By permission of the artist, R. Wheelwright.

THE GREAT DAYS OF COSSACK POWER

national forms of liberty in its own domain. Moscow was otherwise, with its rude Boyars and its low culture, little adapted to benefit a people like the Cossacks, who, accustomed to freedom, stood on a higher plane in politics and culture. The position of the Cossacks, however, became more endurable under the Muscovite sceptre, since definite laws were enforced there; all subjects were equal, and even those outside the Boyar class were not treated more indulgently. The weight of the government was, therefore, felt less acutely.

An independent existence for the Cossack state was impossible. The Cossacks received their material as well as spiritual requirements from Russia. They bought

their weapons in Russian marts, and they owed their very moderate degree of intellectual development to the Orthodox clergy, whose patron the Russian Tsar was. Chmelnicki alone, with his sound common sense, recognised this. A bold and skilful soldier, he was hardly competent for his great task as a statesman; he was no born ruler, but, always regarding himself as a servant of the crown, he only thought how to find out another master for himself. He showed superficiality in his grip of the national and the social questions. He owed the successes which he achieved more to accident and the universal hatred of the Slachta than to his genius. The people did not notice these defects in him; and when he died, on August 25th, 1657, at the age of sixty-four years, a Cossack ballad sang that it was not the wind that groaned and howled in the trees, but the nation bewailing its father Chmelnicki.

It was not long before the Muscovite administration in the Ukraine caused a bitter disappointment. The Polish party therefore grew again, especially among the upper classes, while the people mostly remained loyal to Moscow. There was still vacillation; at one time there were fresh submissions to Poland, as, for instance, in the case of Jurij, Chmelnicki's own son,

at another time there were reversions to Moscow. But there were always the three parties existing in the Ukraine, the Polish, the Turkish, and the Russian, which fought each other with renewed vigour. Soon there was evidence of a deplorable split between the Cossacks and the population which was excluded from the military service. The Cossacks, who acquired large estates, began to separate themselves more sharply as an aristocracy from the lower stratum, over which they wished to rule, like the Slachta in Poland. The democratic spirit, which had formerly worked wonders in the Ukraine and had inspired and morally elevated the whole people, gradually disappeared. Soon the hate of the people turned against the Cossacks

themselves, who became their oppressors. When the reorganisation of the government and the army was completed under Peter the Great and a standing army was raised, the Cossacks no longer fitted into the new political and military structure. But Peter still spared them. It was only when Hetman Ivan Mazepa (the hero of Byron's poem) had attempted in the Northern War (1707) to emancipate the Ukraine with the help of the Swedes, and had entered into secret negotiations with Charles XII., that Peter struck about him with his usual cruelty; he took no further con-



MAZEPPA: HERO OF BYRON'S POEM
In the Northern War of 1707, Hetman Ivan Mazepa, whom the poet Byron has immortalised, made an effort to free the Ukraine, with Swedish help; this led to the abolition, by Peter the Great, of the office of Hetman.

sideration for the separate interests of the Cossacks. instituted in Moscow a special "Chancery for Little Russian affairs," and abolished the office of Hetman.

Menschikov captured the Sjetch of the Saporogi on the island of Chortiza, and they now emigrated to the Crimea. They were recalled to the Dnieper under the Empress Anna in 1737. They did not recognise their country again. Southern Russia had become quickly settled after the subjugation of the Tartar khanates, and was covered with towns. The steppe, through which the Cossacks had roamed like the Arabs through their desert, had been transformed into a populous land. Discontented with



KAMLUCKS AND THEIR HOUSES IN ASTRAKHAN



IN THE TEA MARKET AT ASTRAKHAN



THE CARPET FAIR IN THE KREML AT ASTRAKHAN

SCENES IN THE ANCIENT CITY OF ASTRAKHAN, FORMERLY KNOWN AS SARAI

THE GREAT DAYS OF COSSACK POWER

this, they wished their old land to be restored to them and changed back again into a waste—a further proof that they, the knights of robbery and plunder, were no longer suited to the new age and an organised government. Once again in the time of Catharine II. a savage social and religious war against Poles, Jews, and Catholics blazed forth, when the Cossacks, together with Haidamakes and every sort of riffraff, wreaked their fury and pillaged whole towns like Umani. Gonta and Selisnjak were the ringleaders; the Greek clergy once more added fuel to the flames. At last, in 1775, Potemkin, by Catharine's orders, took the Sjetch and destroyed it. One part of the insurgents emigrated to Turkey; the rest remained as Cossacks of the Black Sea; they received the southern shore of the Sea of Azov and the island of Fanagoria as their homes, with a special constitution. This was the end of the free Cossack life; it survived only in songs.

Catharine II., being alarmed by revolts, especially by that of Pugatchef (1774), and also indignant because her new settlements and towns in the south were injured in their development by a population of born robbers, declared, in the decree of May 3rd, 1783, in spite of her liberal views, all the crown peasants of Little Russia, and therefore the peasants among the Cossacks, to be serfs—a measure by which 1,500,000 peasants were presented to the nobles. When in the same year she united the Crimea (the Tartar Cossacks) with the empire, "the old life of those half-nomads, half-robber knights, with all its romance and adventure, ceased for ever in the south, and the stillness of the grave sank over that country where for centuries a noisy life had pulsed." A similar phenomenon came to light in the territory belonging to the state of Moscow, and to some extent in the adjoining districts. The peasant population was no better treated there than in Poland;

the treatment of the serfs became more and more oppressive, only with the distinction that it was not so much the Boyars here, as the state itself and the magistrates, who ill-treated the people with true Oriental brutality, and extorted from them the uttermost farthing. Whole districts be-

came depopulated. According to the official report there were in one region of 460 square miles (German) only 123 inhabited settlements and 967 deserted ones; the reason often given for this was "the tsar's taxes and imposts." The people emigrated by thousands; the limitation and the subsequent abolition of the right of emigration proved ineffectual. All the pretenders to the Russian crown found supporters among the Cossacks or started from that country. Among the more famous chieftains we may mention Bolotnikof, who encouraged the bands to murder the Boyars, to appropriate their goods, their wives

and daughters, to plunder the warehouses of the merchants and divide all state offices among themselves; then the dreaded Hetman Stenka (Stefan) Rasin in the time of the Tsar Alexis (1667-1671); Kondratij Bulavin under Peter the Great (1707-1708); Pugatchef, who gave himself out to be Peter III.; further two pseudo-Demetri; they were all supported by these bands. This was the harvest which the state of Moscow reaped from the Asiatic brutality of its policy. But among the Cossacks also arose Jarmak Timofejef, who became famous by the conquest of Siberia, and then Deschnef, the discoverer in 1648 of the strait between America and Asia which was later rediscovered by Behring and called after him. Cossacks conquered Azov and wished to surrender it to the tsar. Nevertheless, the revolts of these Cossacks gave the Russian government much trouble. It was only after the defeat of Pugatchef under Catharine II. that their wide domains became gradually reduced to order.



PUGATCHEF: A LEADER OF REVOLT
Catharine II. was much alarmed at the frequent revolts, and at the hindered development of her new towns in the south in consequence of these outbreaks. Pugatchef, who gave himself out to be Peter III., in 1774, was a particularly dangerous revolutionary.

**Cossacks at
Last Reduced
to Order**

(1707-1708); Pugatchef, who gave himself out to be Peter III.; further two pseudo-

Demetri; they were all sup-

**The Serfs
Under Harsh
Treatment**

where for centuries a noisy life had pulsed." A similar phenomenon came to light in the territory belonging to the state of Moscow, and to some extent in the adjoining districts. The peasant population was no better treated there than in Poland;



THE FALL OF POLAND

AND ITS PARTITION AFTER 800 YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE

THE loss of the Ukraine was not the sole disaster which befell Poland in 1654. The war for it with Moscow and Turkey was almost worse. But the Swedish king, Charles X. Gustavus, against whose accession John II. Casimir (1648-1668) raised a protest, also declared war with Poland. In addition to these Prince George Rakoczy II. of Transylvania attacked Poland in 1657. For many years Poland had not been faced by such great danger. Warsaw and Cracow were in the hands of the Swedes; the Great Elector of Brandenburg took Prussia; Wilna and Red Russia were occupied by the Russians and Cossacks, and Rakoczy was committing the most terrible ravages. The king fled to Silesia. The saddest feature was that the Slachta joined the Swedes, and that there were traitors who roused rebellion against their own sovereign. The nobler minds formed a league, at whose head the king placed himself; and an alliance was concluded with Austria and Denmark.

In spite of some successes, Poland was forced to submit to great sacrifices. In the treaty of Wehlau (September 29th, 1657) she renounced the suzerainty of Prussia in favour of the Elector Frederic William; by this concession the duchy of Prussia was definitely lost. By the treaty with Sweden, concluded on May 3rd, 1660, in the Cistercian monastery of Oliva near Dantzic, Poland had to cede Elbing and Livonia; besides this, John Casimir abandoned his rights of inheritance in Sweden, and was only allowed to assume for his life the title of King of Sweden.

The Polish arms were comparatively most successful in the Ukraine, where the Poles succeeded in winning over to their side a part of the Cossacks under Wyhovskij.

Even the son of Chmelnicki submitted to Poland. Nevertheless, Poland was compelled by the truce of Andrussov (January

20th, 1667) to cede to Moscow Smolensk, Severien, Czernigov, and the Ukraine on the left bank of the Dnieper for thirteen years, and Kiev for two years. The war with Turkey, which had been brought about by the defeat of a part of the Cossacks under Doroszenko, similarly ended with a humiliating peace for Poland at Buczac (Budziek), which was concluded eventually under Michael, the successor of John Casimir, on September 18th, 1672. According to its terms Poland ceded part of the Ukraine to Doroszenko, Podolia with the fortress of Kamieniec (Kamenez) to Turkey, and consented to pay an annual tribute of 22,000 ducats.

Still more unfortunate for Poland were the moral degeneracy of its Slachta and the general corruption of public life. Each group concluded peace on its own account with the enemy; the parties were hostile to each other and stirred up ill-will against the king; even individual officials carried out an independent policy. Many were in the pay of foreign powers, among them, for instance, the primate of the empire and John Sobieski, the subsequent king; the high dignitaries publicly taunted each other with venality.

It was in the year 1652 that a single deputy from Troki in Lithuania, Vladislav Sicinski by name, dissolved the Reichstag, which had been summoned at a dangerous crisis, by interposing his veto. That the validity of a resolution of the Reichstag depended on the assent of each individual member—the "liberum veto"—was the essence of the constitution; each individual was the embodiment of the majesty of the empire. Unanimity in all the resolutions of the Reichstag had already been demanded, and minorities had before this dissolved the Reichstag. But it was unprecedented that an individual should have dared to make the fullest use of the "liberum veto." Foreign interference and

**Poland's
Concessions
to Moscow**

THE FALL OF POLAND

the exercise of influence on the imperial policy were henceforward much simplified, since all that was now required was to win over one single individual.

But then, as formerly, as if that was the obvious course, the blame was laid on the king. John Casimir was cautious and bold, but nevertheless the *Slachta* hated him. He was accused of indifference, no regard was paid to him, and his deposition was discussed. He anticipated this last proceeding, as he resolved to lay down the crown voluntarily. There was still much haggling about the annuity payable to him, just as he had formerly been forced from motives of economy to marry his brother's widow, Marie Louise, in order that the country might not require to keep up two queens. The abdication took place on September 16th, 1668. The Senate and the Chamber of Provincial Deputies met in a joint session. With touching words of farewell the weeping king laid on the table of the house the deed of abdication, and the whole assembly wept with him. But the whole state, as it were, abdicated in the person of the king; his retirement was the most tangible proof of the impossible position of public affairs.

The ex-king revisited Sokal, Cracow, and Czenstochau; he learned of the election of his successor, the feeble Michael Thomas Korybut Wisnioviecki (1669-1673), and went to France, where he died at St. Germain on December 16th, 1672. Shortly before that, King Michael had been forced to conclude the shameful peace of Buczacz. He was the son of that voivode, Jeremias Wisnioviecki of Reussen, who had once vented his fury on the Ukraine Cossacks; but he had not inherited the warlike abilities of his father. Under the prevailing republican conditions

the kingship of Poland in the seventeenth century meant little more than a superfluous ornament, and this was exemplified in Wisnioviecki with peculiar force.

Contemporary Polish literature, which is characterised by the same shallowness as the political life, is a true mirror of the faults and vices of the *Slachta*. There were few exceptions. We find an apt criticism of it in the *Respublica Poloniae* (Leiden, 1627): "The king can do just so much as he can personally effect by good fortune and cleverness. The nobles do what they like; they associate with the king, not as peers, but as brothers."

In the person of John III. Sobieski (elected after the death of Wisnioviecki on May 19th, 1674), who had distinguished himself as a general against the Turks, Poland obtained a king who would have been capable of retrieving the losses of recent years and of winning fresh glory for the empire. He clung with the full force of his soldierly nature to the plan entertained by the greatest kings of Poland of opening the decisive campaign against Turkey in alliance with Moscow and Austria, since he rightly saw that the future of Poland de-

pendent on it. This idea led him in 1683 to Vienna, where he defeated the Ottomans.

This brilliant victory, which made him celebrated in the whole Christian world, and further successes in Hungary, were the last rays of sunlight in which the fame of Poland shone. A thorough statesman, he treated also the religious question from the political standpoint, and thought he could end the disputes between the Roman Catholics and the other confessions by a synod, which he convened at Lublin in 1680 and then at Warsaw. From this higher point of view he organised the Ukraine, adopting



JOHN II. CASIMIR

Reigning during a period of wars and rebellions (1648-1668), Casimir placed himself at the head of a league which succeeded in bringing about an alliance with Austria and Denmark. He abdicated in 1668, dying in France in 1672.

just and lenient measures, and in this way he won over a large part of the Cossacks.

He did not hesitate at great self-sacrifices in order to attain his purpose of annihilating the Turks. At the beginning of 1656 he sent Christopher Grzymulowski to Moscow to conclude an alliance with the Tsaritsa Sophia. Poland ceded, on April 21st, in perpetuity, Smolensk, Czernigov, Dorogobush, Sterodab, and Kiev, with the whole of the Ukraine on the left bank of the Dnieper. Moscow was to pay 146,000 roubles, and to wrest the Crimea from the Tartars. The Polish hero, with tears in his eyes, took the oath to this "eternal peace" with Russia, in the hope that he had won this state for his great plans.

But Moscow was then still too barbarous to entertain such noble ideas, and too weak to be able to carry them out. Sobieski saw himself thrown on his own resources. But in his noble efforts he, like his predecessors, was always hindered by that social and political corruption in his own country which rendered every great undertaking abortive. At the beginning of his reign he was full of ideas of a coup d'état, but was compelled, like all the others, to give up every hope. The actions of this monarch furnish a proof that even capable men may become the slaves of circumstances. Men should be accounted great not according to their achievement, but according to their endeavour.

The Slachta did not even allow him to nominate his son Jacob Lewis as his successor; they felt indeed a malicious joy when the latter did not receive the promised hand of an Austrian princess, and they tried to thwart even his marriage with a rich Lithuanian. Filled with mortification and weighed down by care, John III. sank into his grave on June 17th, 1696.

The reign of Sobieski was the last flickering gleam in the life of the Polish state. The terrible times of John Casimir now seemed to have come back; party feuds began afresh and with redoubled fury. Hitherto, individuals or parties had betrayed and sold their country, but now kings did the same; foreign countries had hitherto made their influence felt in Poland only by residents and money, but now they did so directly by troops, which never left the borders of the realm and enforced the orders of their sovereigns by the sword. The Slachta formerly, loving freedom beyond all else, had refused to

make any sacrifices to the dictates of sound policy or to listen to any reform; but now foreign countries were eagerly desirous of maintaining the existing conditions and admitted no reforms. Foreign mercenaries took up their quarters in Poland, established arsenals, fought each other, and traversed the territory of the republic in every direction without asking leave.

Even before this time the neighbouring powers had entertained no great respect for the sovereignty of the Polish state. In 1670 the Great Elector had ordered a Prussian

nobleman to be forcibly seized from the very side of King Michael Wisnioviecki and led away to Königsberg. John Casimir himself, even in the reign of his brother Vladislaus, while travelling in the west of Europe, and driven by a storm on the French coast, was kept two years in imprisonment without any special feeling being caused in his country at the incident. Poland was now treated with undisguised contempt.

In the old days, when, according to the ancient custom at a coronation, money was scattered among the crowd, no Pole ever stooped to pick up a coin; now they all clutched with both hands at



THE FEEBLE KING MICHAEL

Unlike his powerful father, the voivode Jeremias Wisnioviecki, King Michael had but little will of his own, and was easily influenced by those around him. He was, in fact, little more than a superfluous ornament; he died in 1673.

THE FALL OF POLAND

doles from whatever side they came. Formerly the Slachta had imposed harsh conditions on foreign candidates for the throne, and had stipulated for the recovery of lost provinces, but now no king could be elected without the consent of foreign powers, obtained by humiliating promises. National and religious intolerance grew in consequence stronger. Rome and the Jesuits had great influence, and indefatigably carried out their task of forcible conversion and merciless oppression against all who were not of their creed.

The Elector Frederick Augustus (the Strong) of Saxony, or as King of Poland Augustus II. (1697-1733), owed his election partly to the money which he distributed, but mostly to the circumstance that he had adopted the Catholic faith on June 1st, 1697.

In the year 1733 the Reichstag declared heterodox persons to have forfeited all political rights and offices, and by this action had given a new pretext to foreign powers for interference in the affairs of the empire. The sudden dissolution of the diets was now the ordinary course of things. Under Augustus II., out of eighteen diets between the years 1717 and 1733 only five brought their deliberations to a close; under Augustus III.,

only one. Even the law courts were often hindered in their duties by party contests and were compelled to suspend their sittings.

Since the state machinery was stopped recourse was had to alliances and armed combinations which led more certainly to the goal. But it was not difficult even for a foreign power to call into life, to suit their own purposes, some such "confederation." They grew up like mushrooms, fought against each other, and increased the confusion. Together with political disorganisation, the impoverishment of the Slachta made alarming progress. Destitute nobles, who now lived only on the patronage and favour of the high nobility, crowded in masses round the rich magnates, whose

numbers also steadily decreased. As a natural consequence, the peasants were inhumanly oppressed. The towns, more and more burdened by the national needs, were equally impoverished, especially since they never enjoyed the favour of the crown.

The Jesuit schools now only fostered a specious learning, and only educated soldiers of Christ, who were intended to set up in Poland the Society of Jesus rather than the kingdom of God. Even the Piarists, an order established in 1607, who founded schools



JOHN III. SOBIESKI: ENEMY OF THE TURKS

This great king came too late to avert Poland's impending doom. In happier circumstances he might have saved the empire and won for it fresh glory; as it was, he crushed the Ottoman power, and thus became celebrated in the whole Christian world. He was a thorough statesman as well as a brilliant general. Disappointed, he died in 1696.



**MONUMENT AT WARSAW TO THE POLISH KING
JOHN III. SOBIESKI**

in rivalry with the Jesuits, were more solicitous for their own popularity than for the diffusion of true knowledge. The morality and culture of the Slachta were on a disgracefully low level; and their condition was the more repellent since it bore no proportion to their ambition, their pretensions, or position in the realm.

Punishing Poland
"For Its Sins" The empire had thus been engaged in a deadly struggle for a century. If its neighbours allowed it to last so long, the only reason was that they were not themselves ready and strong enough to swallow Poland up. They jealously watched and counterbalanced each other. It was with good reason that the saying "Poland stands by disorder" now became a current proverb.

Frederic Augustus of Saxony and Poland, physically so strong that he could bend a thaler between his fingers, and a thorough man of the world, seemed as a Polish writer aptly puts it, to have been chosen by Providence to punish the nation for its sins. Frivolous in private and often also in public life, he introduced immorality and political corruption into his surroundings. In 1699 he had just reaped the fruits of the campaigns of his great predecessor by the treaty of Karlovitz, through which Poland recovered from Turkey Podolia and Kamieniec, when he plunged Poland into a war which almost cost him the throne.

He made friendly overtures to Peter the Great of Russia and planned with him a campaign against Sweden; Livonia was to be the prize of victory. The Danish king, Frederic IV. was then drawn into the alliance, and the Saxon troops, which Augustus always kept in Poland, began the war. But the allies had grievously deluded themselves in the person of the youthful King of Sweden. Charles XII. struck blow after blow with crushing effect. While Russia by her natural weight and

Plucky Sweden
and Its Youthful King not by her warlike skill was finally able to conquer the little country of Sweden, Augustus II. and Denmark could not make any stand against it. Charles XII. demanded from the Slachta the deposition of the king, and ordered the election of Stanislaus Lesczynski as king on June 12th, 1704.

Augustus II. tried in vain to win over Charles XII. He repeatedly offered him, through secret emissaries, a partition of

Poland, but was obliged, on September 24th, 1706, when Charles had also conquered Saxony, to renounce the crown of Poland by the treaty of Altranstadt, and did not recover it until Charles XII. had been decisively defeated by Peter the Great at Poltawa on July 8th, 1709. The only power to benefit from this second Northern War was Russia, finally which acquired Livonia, Esthonia, and Ingria, and so set foot on the Baltic.

From the beginning of his reign Augustus II. entertained the idea of strengthening the monarchical power; he kept Saxon troops in Poland, and did not consult the Reichstag. But although he possessed considerable talents as a ruler, the various schemes which he evolved all turned out disastrously for Poland. The opposition against him daily grew stronger, and the followers of Lesczynski, who was deposed on August 8th, 1709, increased in numbers; confederations were formed on both sides. Russia brought matters to a head. Rapidly, and with astonishing astuteness, Peter the Great found his way in the Polish difficulty, and knew how to act. He came

Peter the Great
"Protector of Poland" between the parties as a mediator, but took the side of Augustus as the least dangerous; he sent, as the "Protector of Poland," 18,000 men into the country, and negotiated an agreement between the rival parties in Warsaw.

Augustus II. promised to withdraw his Saxons from the country within twenty-five days; all confederations were broken up and prohibited for the future, and the constitution was safeguarded. In a secret clause the number of troops in Poland was limited; Poland was not to keep more than 17,000, Lithuania not more than 6,000 men. The Reichstag of 1717 was forced to approve of all these points without discussion, for which reason it was called the "Dumb Diet." This was a master move of Peter's, and all the more so since he succeeded in inducing Turkey to recognise this agreement. Since that date Russian troops never left Poland, a policy observed up to the last partition.

Another neighbour had to be considered during the dispute for the Polish succession, in the person of the Elector Frederic of Brandenburg. He retorted to the promotion of the Elector of Saxony to the throne of Poland by crowning himself as King of Prussia, on January 18th, 1701. This action of his meant that he

THE FALL OF POLAND

withdrew from the federation of the German Empire with one part of his territory, and shifted the centre of gravity of power as a sovereign to Prussia, which was not indeed subject to the suzerainty of the emperor; attention was at the same time called to the fact that he claimed the other part of Prussia, which still was subject to Poland.

The far-sighted policy of the Prussian king and his successors is shown by their unwearying solicitude for the organisation and strengthening of their army. The numerical superiority of the Russian and other troops was intended to be balanced by the efficiency of the Prussians. Frederic I. was also approached by Augustus II. with the plan of partitioning Poland. Thus he, the King of Poland, was the first to suggest to his neighbours the idea of its partition. The third occasion was in the year 1732, when he hoped by this offer to win over the Prussian king for the election of his son Frederic Augustus as King of Poland.

The Reichstag, it is true, after the death of Augustus II. (February 1st, 1733), elected with unusual unanimity Stanislaus Lesczynski on September 11th, for the second time. But the Slachta forgot that their resolutions were meaningless against the will of a stronger power. Forty



STANISLAUS I : TWICE KING OF POLAND

The troubled condition of Polish affairs is reflected in the history of Stanislaus Lesczynski, who was elected to the throne in 1704. Five years later, in 1709, he was deposed on the return of Augustus, at whose death, in 1733, he was, for the second time, elected to the throne. But he had to give way to Frederic Augustus II. of Saxony.

thousand Russians entered Poland, and Russia's protégé, Frederic Augustus II. of Saxony, was elected king on January 17th, 1734, with the title of Augustus III. France was obliged to acquiesce in the defeat of her candidate, Lesczynski. He received Lorraine and Bar as a solatium (1735-1738). He was occupied to the day of his death (February 23rd, 1766) with the thought of his unhappy native land, and ultimately collected round him at Nancy and Luneville, the youth of Poland, in order to educate them as reformers.

It was now perceived, even in Poland, that the catastrophe could not be long delayed. The voices that demanded reform grew more numerous. It is a tragic spectacle to see how the nobler minds in the nation exerted themselves vainly in carrying reforms and saving their country. Two great parties (at the head of the one was the Tsartoryski family, at the head of the other the Potocki) were bitter antagonists. The former wished to redeem Poland with the help of Russia; the latter, with the support of France. Both were wrong in their calculation, for the salvation of Poland was not to be expected from any foreign power, but depended solely on the unanimity and self-devotion of the nation itself, and this



STANISLAUS II. : POLAND'S LAST KING

The end of the Polish Empire was in sight when, in 1784, Stanislaus II. Poniatowski ascended the throne. He did nothing to stem the rapid tide of ruin or to prevent the country's shameful betrayal by its aristocracy. In 1795, Stanislaus resigned the crown, and died three years later.

was unattainable. The whole reign of Augustus III. (he died on October 5th, 1763) is filled with these party feuds.

The evil star of Poland willed that in the second half of the eighteenth century Prussia and Russia should possess, in the persons of Frederic the Great and Catharine II., rulers who are reckoned among the greatest in history, while Poland herself was being ruined by disunion. In 1764, soon after the death of Augustus II., both the adjoining states came to an agreement as to an occupation of parts of Poland's territory. Stanislaus II. Poniatowski, a relation of the Tsartoryski family, who had been elected king on October 7th, 1764, had lived hitherto in St. Petersburg, and had been, as a

William I. of Prussia, had already inquired, through their representatives in Russia, what attitude the tsar would adopt on the fall of the Polish Empire. The idea of a partition of Prussia had already been dispelled by the Seven Years' War; and the Prussian hero of that war, Frederic the Great, was quite ready to apply the idea to Poland. Neither England nor France intervened when, in February, 1772, at the beginning of 1793, and on October 24th, 1795, Poland was partitioned between Russia, Prussia, and Austria, and the Polish Empire disappeared from the map of Europe. The people of Poland had also to endure the mortification of seeing their own diet concur in these outrages of the great powers.



TARTAR CASTLE IN POLAND DURING THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES
favourite of Catharine, intended for the throne of Poland. This circumstance in itself gave grounds for supposing that this king, in spite of his amiable nature, would be a tool of the Russian policy.

The Tsartoryskis, indeed, wished to use the opportunity and introduce useful reforms, and took up a strong position against Russia; but confederations were soon formed for the protection of the old liberties, and these received the support of Russia, whose interest it was to keep up the lack of central authority in Poland. All the European powers then showed a singular eagerness for expansion; the idea of partition seemed to be in the air. The Emperor Charles VI. and Frederic

Thus the Polish state after lasting 800 years, ceased to be. Poland, in the search for the solution of the main constitutional question, went to excess and was choked by the exuberance of individual license.

After this date there were frequent rumours of efforts to be made by Polish patriots, especially by those who had emigrated to France, to recover political independence; European diplomacy has often been occupied with the Polish question. But beyond friendly encouragement the Poles have found no friend who, with powerful hand, could and would have reversed the momentous events of the last decades of the eighteenth century.

VLADIMIR MILKOWICZ



RUSSIA

THE BEGINNING OF THE NATION RISE AND FALL OF THE FIRST EMPIRE

THE birth of the Russian Empire falls in the period when the Scandinavian Vikings were at the zenith of their power. Just as these hardy rovers sailed over the Baltic, the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, until they reached Iceland and North America, and in their small forty-oared galleys went up from the mouths of the Elbe, the Weser, the Rhine, the Maas and the Seine far into the interior, striking terror into the inhabitants, so, too, in the east of Europe they followed the course of the rivers and discovered the way to the Black Sea and Constantinople. The route which led up the Dwina and then down the Dnieper to Byzantium was called the Varagian way; even the rapids of the Dnieper bore, so it is said, Scandinavian names. The Norsemen, who had founded here and there independent empires in the west of Europe, could do so still more easily in the east.

At the outset of Russian history we find here six or seven independent districts, which stood, perhaps, under Norse rule: (old) Ladoga on the Wolchow, later Novgorod, Bjelosersk, Isborsk, Turow in the region of Minsk, Polock, and Kiev. The core of the later Russian Empire was at first (about 840) in the north, in the Slavonic-Finnish region, but it soon spread toward the south and was then shifted to Kiev in the basin of the Dnieper. "Russia" absorbed the Slavonic, Finnish, Bulgarian and Khazar empires. Rurik, in Norse Hroerekr, an otherwise unknown semi-mythical hero of royal race [see page

3185], was regarded in the eleventh century as the ancestor of the Russian dynasty.


The soil was so favourable here for the growth of a large empire that the Russians were able, by the middle of the ninth century (860), to undertake a marauding expedition against Constantinople. Besides Slavs, Lithuanians, Finns, and Khazars, the

Norse Warriors Ousted by the Slavs Varagians fought; usually it was Swedes from Upland, Södermanland, and Östergötland who formed the picked troops and took the lead in every expedition. The mercenary bands had entered into a covenant with the prince, but were pledged to obey him; they were not, however, his subjects and could, therefore, leave him at any time; their pay consisted in the booty they won. The Slavs composed the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants; they gradually replaced the Norse warriors and ousted them completely later, notwithstanding various reinforcements from their northern home. By the end of the eleventh century the Varagian element had almost disappeared. In less than 250 years the same fate befell them which shortly before had befallen the Finno-Ugrian Bulgars in the Balkan Peninsula. Both races were merged in the Slavonic.

The first hero of the old Varagian style, and at the same time the first genuinely historical ruler, meets us in Oleg, or Helgi, who, in 880, became the head of the Russian state. He conquered (880-881) Smolensk, defeated the petty princes in Kiev in 882, and then transferred thither the centre of the empire. He



THE EARLY RULERS OF RUSSIA
Reproduced from a series of historic medals.



THE RULERS OF RUSSIA FROM 1125 TILL 1276

Reproduced from a series of historic medals.

inflicted on the Khazars and the Bulgarians defeats from which they never recovered. In 900 he forced part of the Chorvats on the Vistula to serve in his army. In this way he founded a Dnieper empire, which reached from the North Sea to the Black Sea, from the Bug to the Volga. Not satisfied with this, Oleg planned an expedition against Byzantium, which, like Rome and Italy, was always the coveted goal of every Northman. In the year 907 he went with a mighty army of allies down the Dnieper; the Russian Chronicle states that he had 2,000 boats with forty men in each. As the harbour in the Bosphorus was closed, he beached his ships, set them on wheels, bent his sails, and thus advanced against the town, to the horror of his enemies, with his vessels from the landside. A propitious moment had been chosen. The Greek fleet had fallen into decay, and the empire was hard pressed by the Bulgarians. The Emperor Leo VI. (the Philosopher) determined, therefore, to bribe the Russians to withdraw, after an ineffectual attempt had been made to get rid of them by poisoned food. The Greeks paid six pounds of silver for every ship, and in addition gave presents for the Russian towns.

Liberty of trading with Constantinople was then secured to the Russians. Their merchants, however, were to enter the city only by a certain gate and unarmed, under the escort of an imperial official; their station was near the church of St. Mammas. They received also the right to obtain for six months provisions in the city, to visit baths, and to demand provisions and ships' gear (anchor, cables, and sails) for their return voyage. This treaty, having been concluded by word of mouth, was sworn to by the Byzantines on the cross, and by Oleg and his vassals before their gods Peran and Wolas, and on their weapons. When the Russians left the city, Oleg fastened his shield to the city wall, as a token that he had taken possession of the city. This treaty was reduced to writing in the year 911—a noteworthy document. Both parties first promise love and friendship to each other, and fix the penalties to be incurred by any who disturb their concord through murder, theft, or indiscretion. Then follow agreements as to the ransom

of prisoners of war and slaves, as to servants who had deserted or been enticed away, and as to the estates of the Russians (Varangians or Varagians) who had died in the service of the emperor. The proviso as to shipwrecked men is important as a contribution to international law. "If the storm drives a Greek vessel on to a foreign coast, and any Russians inhabit such coast, the latter shall place in safety the ship with its cargo and help it on its voyage to the Christian country and pilot it through any dangerous places. But if such ship, either from storm or some other hindrance, cannot reach home again, then we Russians will help the sailors and recover the goods, if this occurs near the Greek territory. Should, however, such a calamity befall a Greek ship (far from Greece), we are willing to steer it to Russia and the cargo may be sold. Any part of it that cannot be sold and the ship itself we Russians are willing to bring with us honestly, either when we go to Greece or are sent as ambassadors to your emperor, or when we come as traders to buy goods, and we will hand over untouched the money paid for the merchandise. Should a

The Legend of a Wizard's Prophecy

Russian have slain a man on this vessel or have plundered any goods, the agreed penalty will be inflicted on him." Oleg died in the year 912, from the bite of a snake, which, it was alleged, crept out of the skull of his favourite steed; hence arose the legend about the marvellous fulfilment of a wizard's prophecy that he should meet his death from that horse. Nine hundred years later Oleg became a favourite hero of Catharine II., who extolled him in a drama bearing his name.

His successor, Igor or Ingvar, a less capable ruler, carried the work of conquest a stage further. In the year 914 the Russians went with 500 ships to the Caspian Sea and plundered the Persian coasts. The Arab Mascudi has described this expedition, which appears to have been made during the minority of Igor, when his wife Olga (Helga) administered the affairs of the state. He himself took command of the army in 941, when he planned a new expedition against Constantinople; about the same time the Pechenegs, at his instigation, undertook to plunder Bulgaria, which had been allied with Byzantium since 924. But on this occasion the Russian fleet was annihilated by the Greek fire, with which the Russians

Oleg's Symbol of Victory



A RITUAL MASSACRE OF THE WARRIORS OF SVYATOSLAV AT TOULON, IN THE TENTH CENTURY. This great painting by Semenovskoy shows the warriors of Svayatoslav, the ruler of the Danube, in the act of killing the Bulgarians. The scene is set in the Danube valley, where the Bulgarians were conquered by Svayatoslav in 972. In 972, the Bulgarians were conquered by Svayatoslav.

now made their first acquaintance. In 944, Igor marched once more against Byzantium—the fourth Russian campaign against the capital. Igor was induced by peasants to withdraw, and a new treaty was then concluded (945). The old trading privileges of the Russians were somewhat restricted. Certain goods, for example, might not be sold to them, and strict passports were demanded from them. The Russians, in addition to this, pledged themselves to protect the region of the Chersonnese against attacks of the Danubian Bulgars, and to come to the aid of the Greek emperor in time of need.

The treaty was once more solemnly sworn. "And we," so it runs in the Russian version of the document, "so many of us as are baptised, have sworn in the cathedral of St. Elias (at Kiev), on the holy cross lying before us and this parchment, to hold and observe all that is written thereon, and not to transgress any part thereof. If any man transgress this, whether he be the prince himself or another, whether Christian or unbaptised, may he be deprived of all help from God; let him become a serf in this life and in the life to come, and let him die by his own sword. The unbaptised Russians shall lay their shields, their naked swords, their gorgets, and other arms on the ground and swear to everything contained in this parchment; to wit, that Igor, every Boyar, and all the Russians will uphold it for ever. But if any man, be he prince or Russian subject, baptised or unbaptised, act contrary to the tenor of this document, let him die deservedly by his own sword, and let him be accursed by God and by Perun, since he breaketh his oath. May the great Prince Igor deign to preserve his sincere love for us, and not weaken it, so long as the sun shineth and the world remaineth in this and all future time." On his return home, Igor was murdered by the Drevlanes,

The Dreadful Fate of Prince Igor from whom he wished to exact tribute; according to Leo the Deacon he was bound to two saplings, which were bent to the ground, and was torn in two, after the manner of Sinis in the Greek legend of Theseus.

Since Igor's son Sviatoslav was a minor, his widow Olga held the reins of government. She first wreaked vengeance on the Drevlanes. While besieging their town, Korosten, she promised to make

a peace with them in return for a tribute of three pigeons and three sparrows from every house. She then ordered balls of lighted tow to be fastened on the birds, which were let loose and set fire to the houses and outhouses of the Drevlanes. The Chronicle styles Olga the wisest of women. She was the first to accept Christianity; in 957 she went with a large retinue to Constantinople, and under the sponsorship of the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenetus and the Empress Helena, daughter of Romanus Lacapenus, received baptism and the name of Helena from the patriarch Theophylactus. She endeavoured to win her son over to the new doctrine; "My družina [body-guard, huscarbes] would despise me," he is said to have replied.

In 964 Sviatoslav himself, the greatest hero of old Russia, took over the government, although his mother (who died in 970) still administered home affairs, since he was seldom in the country. He wished to complete the task which Oleg and Igor began. He turned his attention first against the still unconquered peoples on the Oka and Volga, marched against the Wiatici and then against the Khazars, whose town Belaweza (Belaja Vesh or Sarkel) he captured; after subjugating the Jases (old Russian for Alanes, or in Georgian Owsî = Ossetes) and the Kasoges (Tcherkesses) he returned to Kiev. After the year 966 the Wiatici paid tribute to Sviatoslav; shortly afterwards (968-969) the Ros (apparently Baltic Vikings independent of Sviatoslav) laid waste Bulgaria as well as the Khazar towns Itil, Khazaran, and Samandar. These blows were so crushing that during the next fifty years we hear nothing more of the Khazars.

Shortly before these events Sviatoslav, acceding to the request of the Emperor Nicephorus Phocas, backed up by a payment of fifteen hundredweight of gold (180,000 Byzantine gold pieces), had undertaken a campaign against the Danubian Bulgars; they were to be attacked simultaneously from north and south. In the summer of 968 Sviatoslav crossed the Danube, defeated the Bulgars, captured numerous places, and took up his abode in Perejaslavetz. Sviatoslav was already planning to establish himself firmly in Bulgaria, since Peter, the Bulgarian ruler, died at the end of January, 969, when tidings came from Russia that the wild

THE BEGINNING OF THE RUSSIAN NATION

Pechenegs were besieging Kiev. They were induced temporarily to withdraw by the ruse of a false report that Sviatoslav was advancing with all speed against them; but the people of Kiev accused Sviatoslav of indifference. He therefore retraced his steps as quickly as possible, defeated the Pechenegs, and restored peace.

But his heart was still fixed on Bulgaria, since Perejaslavetz on the Danube was the centre of his country, and a place where all good things were collected together: "from the Greeks gold and precious stuffs, wine and fruits; from the Bohemians and Hungarians silver and horses; from Russia furs, wax, honey and slaves." In the end, Sviatoslav divided his empire among his three sons and marched towards the south-west.

John Tzimiskes had now come to the throne of the Byzantine Empire in the place of the murdered Nicephorus Phocas. His predecessor had concluded peace with Bulgaria so soon as he learnt the real plans of Sviatoslav, and Tzimiskes now made a similar attempt, but twice without success. There remained therefore

Russian Women Fight Against Greeks only the arbitrament of the sword. Perejaslavetz and Silistria, to which towns the Russians had withdrawn, were captured by the Greeks, in spite of a most gallant resistance; the Russian women themselves fought hand-to-hand in the *mélée*.

The Russians were seen during the night after a battle coming out of the town by moonlight to burn their dead. They sacrificed the prisoners of war over their ashes, and drowned fowls and little children in the Danube. The emperor proposed to Sviatoslav to decide the victory by single combat. Sviatoslav declined, and was the more bent on a last passage of arms. But when this also turned out disastrously to him, owing to the superiority of the Greek forces, he made overtures for peace (971). The terms were as follows: The emperor promised to provide provisions for the army of Sviatoslav, which withdrew with the honours of war, and not to harass them with the Greek fire during the retreat; he also confirmed the old trading privileges of the Russian merchants.

A meeting of Sviatoslav and Tzimiskes took place on the right bank of the Danube to ratify the settlement. Leo the Deacon has left us a description of his person.

Sviatoslav was of middle height, with blue eyes and thick eyebrows; his nose was flattish, his mouth hidden by a heavy moustache; his beard was scanty, and his head close shorn except for one lock hanging down on each side (a sign of his high birth); his neck rose like a column from his shoulders, and his limbs were

End of Russia's Pagan Age well proportioned. His general aspect was gloomy and savage. A gold ring, set with a ruby between two pearls, hung from one ear; his white tunic was only distinguished from those of his warriors by its cleanliness.

Sviatoslav now set out on his homeward journey. But the Pechenegs were already waiting on the Dnieper. The Greek chroniclers relate that Tzimiskes had requested the Pechenegs to allow the Russian army to pass through without hindrance; but he would probably have done the exact opposite. With a wearied and exhausted army, whose ranks were being thinned by hunger, Sviatoslav went slowly homewards. He was slain by Kuria, the prince of the Pechenegs (973), who had his skull made into a drinking-vessel. Part only of Sviatoslav's army succeeded in making their way to Kiev. This was the end of the greatest hero of Old Russia. A soldier rather than a general or statesman, he was worshipped by his followers. He and Oleg strengthened and consolidated the Old Russian state. The Pagan age of Russia ends with Sviatoslav.

Sviatoslav's three sons were still minors when he divided his empire among them, and each of them was placed under a guardian. Jarapolk was sovereign in Kiev, Oleg in the country of the Drevlanes, Vladimir in Novgorod. Quarrels soon broke out; Oleg fell in battle; Vladimir fled to Scandinavia; Jarapolk thus remained sole ruler. But Vladimir came back with numerous Varagian mercenaries, defeated Jarapolk and besieged him in Rodna. When Jarapolk surrendered, at the demand of his brother, and was on the way to Vladimir, he was murdered by two Varagians at the door of the presence-chamber.

The Hero Vladimir on the Throne

Vladimir thus assumed the government in 977. He, too, was a hero, fought many wars, and conquered numerous tribes. His importance, however, does not lie in this, but in the Christianising of the Russians, which was completed by him.

Merchants had long since brought the Christian doctrines from Byzantium to Russia; several churches already existed in Kiev and elsewhere, and the Christian faith in Russia was free and unmolested. When Olga received baptism, in 957, there was already a considerable Christian community in Kiev. Tradition relates

Vladimir that the Jews, the Moham-
Adopts the medans, the Romans, and the
Greek Faith Byzantines had tried to win Vladimir over to their faith.

He is said to have sent, by the advice of his Boyars and cityelders, envoys into every country, who were to report from their own experience on the value of the different religions. Ten men thus started out, first to the Bulgarians, then to the Germans, lastly to Byzantium. The service in the splendid church of St. Sophia at Byzantium made the best impression on them. This decided the adoption of the Greek faith. Vladimir had indeed no other choice. Unless he made some violent breach with the past, he was bound to establish the Byzantine religion, which was already widely spread in the country, as the national religion.

The decision was taken, as had been the case with the Franks or the Bulgarians, during a campaign. Vladimir, as an ally of the emperor, vowed to become a Christian if he should take Kherson. Christians were already strongly represented in his army. When, then, the town surrendered, he sent to the Emperors Basil II. and Constantine VIII., and asked the hand of their sister Anna. His request was granted on the condition that he would consent to be baptised. Vladimir is said to have attributed the defeats of his great father to the mighty God of the Christians, just as the Byzantines thanked at one time St. Demetrius, at another St. Theodorus Stratilates, for their victories. Vladimir now, therefore, put the Christian God to the proof before

The Christian Kherson, just as Constantine
God Put and Clovis had done in
to the Test similar crises, and since the result was favourable, he

decided to adopt the Christian doctrine. He was, therefore, baptised in 988 in Kherson. The Byzantines conferred on him new royal insignia and the title of *Basileus*, which he at once inscribed on his gold and silver coins. He returned to Kiev, after founding another church in Kherson. The Russian chronicle tells us what a

marvellous change was then accomplished in the character of Vladimir. Formerly a bloodthirsty barbarian, he had once wished to revive the service of the old gods to whom he owed his victory over Jarapolk. He commanded a Perun of wood with a silver head and golden beard to be erected on a hill in the vicinity of his palace at Kiev, and then images of Chors, Dashbog, Stribog, Simargla and Mokosh. Two Christian Varagians were sacrificed to Perun, since the father refused to surrender to the pagan priests his son, on whom the sacrificial lot had fallen. Vladimir had been an unbridled voluptuary. Besides five lawful wives, he had three hundred concubines in Wyszgorod, 300 in Belgorod, and 200 in the village of Berestow near Kiev.

But after the adoption of Christianity he became a changed man. The idols were cast down, and, amid the tears of their worshippers, were partly hacked to pieces, partly burnt. He ordered the Perun, which was most highly revered, to be fastened to the tail of a horse; twelve men then belaboured it with sticks and hurled it into the river. The spot is even now pointed out where the "downfall of the devil" was consummated. Men were posted along the shore to push back into the water the stranded god and to keep off the wailing pagans.

Vladimir then issued a proclamation that any man, whether rich or poor, who did not come to the river bank on the next morning would be considered his enemy. The next day he went to the Dnieper accompanied by the priests. The people stepped into the water and were baptised in crowds. Many followers of the old gods escaped into the steppes or the woods; centuries elapsed before Russia was entirely Christian. Under the direction of the Greeks he started a school at Kiev. Even this encountered difficulties; Vladimir, indeed, was compelled to send many children away from school back to their homes, because their parents regarded writing as a dangerous form of witchcraft.

Kiev, where there was already a bishopric, was now made the see of a metropolitan, and several new bishoprics were founded. The first metropolitan, Michael, came from Constantinople; even in later times the bishops and metropolitans were mostly Greeks, seventeen out of twenty-three, down to the Mongol invasion



THE CHURCH OF ST. SOPHIA, BUILT IN 1037



VIEWS OF THE CHURCHES OF ST. ANDREW AND ST. VLADIMIR



THE BEAUTIFUL MONASTERY OF ST. MICHAEL

THE ANCIENT AND ROYAL CITY OF KIEV: "THE RIVAL OF CONSTANTINOPLE"

of 1240. The first priests are said to have been Bulgarians. It was not until later that the schools provided for their own rising generation.

Vladimir was completely changed. He remained loyal to his Greek wife, distributed his income to the churches and the poor, and no longer took pleasure in wars.

A Great Step in Russian History

In contrast to his previous severity the prince was now mild; he was reluctant, from fear of sin, to enforce death penalties, and, since brigandage was largely on the increase, had to be urged by the bishops to reintroduce the old laws. In all probability, he, like the Emperor Otto III. and Duke Boleslav I. Chabis, had been influenced by the idea of the millennium, and believed that the end of the world would come in the year 1000. He was passionately fond of relics, and came back from Kherson with a rich store of them. He is worshipped in the Russian Church as a saint, and was named Isapostolos, or the Apostle-like.

Although Christianity was only superficially grafted upon national life and was so adapted to Pagan customs and ideas that it was closely interwoven with the old popular religion, nevertheless the conversion was decisive for Russia. By the adoption of the Greek faith it entered into the communion of the Greek Church and into the intellectual heritage of the Greek world, and by so doing was distinctly opposed to the Roman Church and Western civilisation. This step decided the place of Russia in the history of the world. Henceforward Russia shares the fortunes of the Oriental Church, and partly those of the Byzantine Empire. Byzantium had gained more by the conversion of Russia than it could have ever won by force of arms; Russia became in culture and religion a colony of Byzantium without thereby losing political independence. We must not overlook the fact that Byzantium then was the foremost

What Russia Gained from Byzantium

civilised nation, from which all Western Europe had much to learn. Byzantine Christianity brought inestimable advantages to the Russian people—a language for church services, which was understood by all and enriched the vernacular with a host of new words; and an independent church, which promoted culture and at the same time was considered politically as a common focus for all parts of Russia.

Priests and bishops brought books from New Byzantium and disseminated the art of writing. These were followed by architects, builders, scholars, artists and teachers. Splendid edifices rapidly arose in Russia. Kiev with its countless churches was soon able to vie with Byzantium. Vladimir founded a school for the training of the priests. Monasteries were built, which carried culture into distant countries. It was the national church which helped the Russians to impress a Slavonic character on alien races.

The union with Byzantium had, it is true, some disadvantages; but these were not apparent for centuries. After the thirteenth century Byzantine culture retrograded, and Russia suffered the same fate as her instructress. The hatred of the West, which Russia inherited from Byzantium, was transformed, at a period when the Western civilisation stood high, into a hatred of culture. Russia was thus condemned to a sort of stagnation. But it can hardly be asserted with justice that Russia suffered any detriment because in days of danger it could not reckon on

The Fate of Eastern Europe

support from Rome. It is true that Rome was for many centuries the foremost power, but was she able to save Palestine? Russia shared the fate of Byzantium, because that was the fate of all Eastern Europe, which, lying on the frontier of Asia, suffered much from Asiatic hordes. Russia and Byzantium were like breakwaters erected against the waves of Asiatic immigration. That was the drawback of the geographical position. Even the line of states which lay further back, Poland and Hungary, had been partly drawn into the same vortex. Only the states westward of this dividing wall were able to develop their civilisation unhindered.

Since Russia entered fully into the field of Greek thought, it adopted those peculiar conditions which resulted as a consequence of the relations of Church to State in Byzantium. Rome aimed at ecclesiastical absolutism and world-sovereignty. The papacy was not content with a position subordinate to, or even parallel with, the state, but insisted that the spiritual power ranked above the secular. This claim kindled in the West the struggle between the secular power and the Church, the struggle between Papacy and Empire. No such movement disturbed

THE BEGINNING OF THE RUSSIAN NATION

the East. There the Church continued in* that subordination to the state which had existed from the beginning. Hence the omnipotence of the State in Russia, although the Church at all times exercised great influence there. The sovereign could appoint or depose the bishops. Even the ecclesiastical dependence on Byzantium was rather a matter of tolerance and custom than an established right. If the sovereign did not find it agreeable to receive a bishop sent from Byzantium, he substituted another.

The inner change which was worked in Vladimir was in one respect disadvantageous for the empire; there was a loss of energy. In the year 992 Vladimir came into conflict with the Pechenegs on the southern frontier near Perejaslav. A single combat was to decide the day. After a fierce struggle a young Russian succeeded in throttling with his own hands the giant champion of the Pechenegs. In order to protect the country against further attacks, Vladimir established a line of defence. There are indications that he entered into alliances with

Vladimir in Alliance with Rome the West, above all with Rome, Germany, Poland and Bohemia. His son Sviatopolk married the daughter of Boleslav I. of Poland. Possibly there is some connection between this and the fact that Vladimir in 981 took possession of the Czerwenish towns of Halicz and Przemyśl—the later Red Russia—and thus pushed the western frontier of Russia as far as the Carpathians.

In the year 1000, Bruno of Querfurt, styled the Archbishop of the Heathen, came to him, being desirous to preach the Gospel to the wild Pechenegs. Vladimir employed him to negotiate a peace with the Pechenegs, and accompanied him to the frontier. The report which Bruno furnished in 1008 to the Emperor Henry II. gives us a good picture of Vladimir's character. He wrote: "After I had spent a full year among the Hungarians to no purpose, I went amongst the most terrible of all heathen, the Pechenegs. The lord of the Russians (Vladimir), ruler of a wide territory and great riches, detained me for a month, tried to deter me from my purpose, and was solicitous about me, as if I was one who wantonly desired to rush upon destruction. . . . But since he could not move me from my purpose, and since, besides that, a vision concerning

my unworthy self frightened him, he accompanied me with his army for two days to the furthest boundary of his kingdom, which he had surrounded with an exceedingly strong and long palisade. He dismounted; I and my companions went ahead, while he followed with the chief men of his army. Thus we passed through the gate. He took his station on one hill, we on another. I myself carried the cross, which I embraced with my arms, and sang the well-known verse, 'Peter, if thou lovest Me, feed My sheep.'

"When the antiphone was finished, the prince sent one of his nobles to us with the following message: 'I have escorted thee to the spot where my land ends and that of the enemy begins. I beseech thee in God's name not to grieve me by forfeiting thy young life; I know that to-morrow before the third hour thou wilt have to taste the bitterness of death without cause and without gain.' I sent the following answer back to him: 'May God open paradise to thee, as thou hast opened to us the way to the heathen!' We then started, and went two days, and no one did us any harm. On the third day—it was a Friday—we were thrice, at daybreak, noon, and at the ninth hour, brought to execution with bowed neck, and yet each time came out from among the army of the enemy unscathed. On Sunday we reached a large tribe, and a respite was accorded to us until special messengers had summoned the whole tribe to a council. At the ninth hour of the next Sunday we were haled to the meeting. . . . Then a vast multitude rushed upon us . . . and raised a terrible outcry. With a thousand axes and swords they threatened to hew us to pieces. . . . The elders at length tore us forcibly from their hands. They listened to us, and recognised in their wisdom that we had come to them with good intentions. So we stayed for five months with

Converts to Christianity that people, and travelled through three of their districts; we did not reach the fourth, but envoys from their nobles came to us. When some thirty souls had been won for Christianity, we concluded for the acceptance of the king a peace such as they thought no one save we would have been able to conclude. 'This peace,' they said, 'is concluded through thee. If, as thou promisest, it is lasting, we are willing

all to become Christians; but if the prince does not loyally adhere to it, we must then think about war, not Christianity.' With this object I went back again to the prince of the Russians, who for God's sake was contented therewith, and gave his son as hostage. We, however, consecrated one of our number to be bishop, and placed him, together with his son, in the middle of the land. Thus Christian order now prevails among the most cruel and wicked nation of heathens that dwells on the face of the globe." This important letter, which is also the only contemporary account of Vladimir, unfortunately breaks off here. St. Bruno was probably master of some one Slavonic language.

According to the later chroniclers, Vladimir was much beloved by his people. The tradition records with especial pleasure how every week he banqueted with his Druzina and the elders of the city of Kiev. He is celebrated in historical ballad as a sun-god, and called the beautiful red sun of Russia (*krasnoje solnyszko*). The Church reckoned him amongst her saints.

Vladimir died in 1015. Some considerable time probably before his death he had divided his empire among his sons after the following method: Sviatopolk received Turow; Isjaslav, Polock; Boris, Rostow; Gleb, Murom; Sviatoslav, the country of the Drevlanes; Wsevolod, Volhynia; Mstislav, Tmutorokan. Whether or how he disposed of Kiev we are not told. In any case, the quarrel about it broke out immediately after his death. The Druzina had wished for one of the sons of the Greek princess Anna. But Boris, like his brother Gleb, was absent, and the power was seized by Sviatopolk, the son-in-law of Boleslav of Poland, who happened to be on the spot, although an attempt was made to keep secret the death of the father until the arrival of Boris. The latter himself resigned the sovereignty in favour of his elder brother, but nevertheless was assassinated together with Gleb and Sviatoslav. Boris and Gleb were worshipped as holy martyrs, and many churches bear their names.

The other brothers were now seized with panic. Jaroslav of Novgorod marched at once against Sviatopolk,

defeated the "godless" sinner at Lubetch and forced him to fly to Poland. Jaroslav then remained in Kiev; for Sviatopolk, although reinstated in 1017 by Boleslav of Poland—who took this opportunity to conquer Przemyśl in 1018—could not maintain his position. Jaroslav had yet another war to face with Mstislav of Tmutorokon. With the help of the Kasoges, Khazars and Seweranes Mstislav insisted upon a new partition of the empire in 1023; he received the whole country east of the Dnieper, with a residence in Tchernigov. Jaroslav's rule was important for the development of Russia. We notice especially a coolness in the relations with the Varagians, who began to be troublesome and, indeed, dangerous to him. Between them and the Novgorodians there were frequent and sanguinary riots. Jaroslav supported the latter, and sent the Varagians out of the land, as Vladimir had tried to do in 980. Thus the Varagian age of Russia ends with Jaroslav.

Russia already appears as a large Slavonic commonwealth, with a policy of its own and a consciousness of nationality. And, as if the wars with Byzantium had formerly been due merely to Varagian influences, the last occasion when Russia and the empire came into collision occurred under Jaroslav. The *casus belli* was a quarrel between Russian merchants and Byzantines. The punitive expedition with which Jaroslav entrusted his son Vladimir in 1043 ended disastrously, once more in consequence of the devastating effect of the Greek fire. Part only of the Russian army was able to rally and inflict a defeat on the pursuing Greeks.

Jaroslav, though no hero in the style of Sviatoslav, still knew how to handle the sword. He struck the Pechenegs such a blow that they no longer ventured to attack Russia; their name soon disappeared. Their rôle was taken over, however, by another wild people, the Polowzes, whom we already know as Kumanes. In the west, also, Jaroslav fought with Lithuanians, Jatvinges, and Masovians, and helped his son-in-law Casimir of Poland to win back the empire.

Kiev reached the zenith of its grandeur under Jaroslav and excited the admiration of the West; among its churches, which were said to number 400, that of St. Sophia with its splendid mosaics was

THE BEGINNING OF THE RUSSIAN NATION

conspicuous. The city with its eight markets was the rendezvous of merchants from Byzantium, Germany, Scandinavia, Hungary and Holland; flotillas of merchantmen furrowed the waters of the Dnieper.

Jaroslav founded monasteries, for instance, the Crypt Monastery at Kiev, which was destined to become a seminary of culture for Russia. Himself acquainted with writing, he took an interest in schools, and founded one in his beloved Novgorod for 300 boys. He had not artists enough to decorate all the churches, nor priests enough to provide for divine service. He

Jaroslav enjoyed a high reputation among his contemporaries. He formed connections by marriage with the royal houses of Norway, Poland, Hungary and France, and was in request as an ally. The Russian people called him the Wise; the Scandinavian sagas have much to tell of him. If, however, the empire was to be preserved in its old grandeur the succession must be fixed in some way. In old times, when the state was governed in patriarchal style and the sovereign held a paternal authority, when the royal treasury was also the national treasury and the offices at the royal court were also



THE GRAND DUKE VLADIMIR MONOMACH

His government lasted from 1114 till 1125, and was marked by vigour and justice.

summoned Greek choristers from Byzantium to the capital, who were to instruct the Russian clergy. Adam of Bremen was justified, therefore, in calling Kiev the rival of Constantinople and the fairest ornament of Greece. Since Russia had hitherto no written laws, Jaroslav ordered the customary law to be noted down. This simple code contains little beyond a scale of penalties for various crimes, and a fixed table of fines; it does not mention death sentences or corporal punishments. Nevertheless, it was a promising preliminary step. The first ecclesiastical laws for Russia were also put into writing under Jaroslav.

state offices—when, that is, the empire was considered the private property of the monarch, family law was identical with public law, and the sovereign had the control of the kingdom as much as of his own goods and chattels. And just as, according to the civil law of the time, every child had a claim to a part of the paternal or family property, so every member of the reigning house had a claim to a share of the kingdom.

Since, then, according to Germano-Slavonic custom, the eldest of the tribe or of the family administered affairs within the family circle, so in the empire the

younger members were pledged to obey the eldest. This was the so-called "right of seniority." Russia had long been ruled on this principle. The custom had grown up there since the days of Olga that the eldest should have his home in Kiev, while the younger sons lived elsewhere, and were in some sense his subjects. Sviatoslav had divided the kingdom

Jaroslav Prepares for Death

among his sons on this principle, only reserving for himself the title of grand duke.

According to the Russian Chronicle, Jaroslav, foreseeing his death, made the following arrangements: "Isjaslav, your eldest brother, will represent me and reign in Kiev. Subject yourselves to him as you have subjected yourselves to your father. I give to Sviatoslav, Tchernigov, to Wsewolod, Perejaslav, to Wjatshelav, Smolensk. Igor, the youngest, receives Vladimir with Volhynia. Let each be content with his share; if not, then shall the elder brother sit in justice over you as lord. He will defend the oppressed and punish the guilty." By this arrangement Jaroslav had merely acted according to the ancient custom. How far the privileges went which customary law gave to the "eldest" is shown by the expression current at that time; the younger rode at the rein of the elder; he had him as master, stood at his orders, and looked up to him. The grand duke, whose seat was in Kiev, was lord over all Russia; he disposed of vacant principalities, and was the supreme judge and commander-in-chief.

The innovation introduced by Jaroslav probably consisted only in clearly defining the order in which the younger princes should be promoted after the death of the grand duke. The territories, which he assigned to his sons according to their respective age and rank, formed the following scale: Kiev I., Tchernigov II., Perejaslav III., Smolensk IV., Vladimir V. The royal throne was

The Stormy Path to the Throne

only to be reached by proceeding from V. to I. If a junior prince died before the elder, and therefore without having reached Kiev, his sons also remained excluded from the grand ducal title. Thus the son of Vladimir of Novgorod, Rotislav, was forced to abandon any prospect of reaching Kiev. The princes who were thus from the first precluded from advancing, since their fathers had not been grand dukes, were

called Isgoji. But the weakness of the law lay in this very point; for those who were set aside felt the injustice of it,* and had recourse to arms. Parties were formed which were bitter foes to each other.

The position of the grand duke at the same time was not strong enough to ensure order. His power rested on the idea of a paternal authority which was deficient in any true basis of power; he had, in fact, only obtained one share, like the others. If he wished to enforce the right of seniority, he was compelled to look out for alliances. And since self-interest usually outweighs patriotism, Russia was plunged into long years of civil war through the increasing numbers of the royal house. Subsequently many petty principalities, which were unceasingly at war with each other, sprang up side by side in Russia, since the legal arrangement was broken down by unforeseen contingencies. The root of the evil is to be found in that defective legislation and in the large increase of the Rurikoviches.

Thus the heroic age ended with Jaroslav. Russia, parcelled out into numerous provinces, its strength sapped by prolonged civil wars, soon sank from the pinnacle which it had reached in its days of prosperity. Perhaps for this reason tradition has shed a flood of glory round the last prince and despot of the old era.

The very first successor of Jaroslav, the Grand Duke Isjaslav, whom his father had placed on the throne at Kiev during his lifetime, could not maintain his position. The people of Kiev banished him and raised to the throne a prince who stood outside the prescribed order of succession. A hot dispute soon broke out which was destined to last for centuries. Not a single Russian prince was ashamed to invoke, in case of need, the help of Poles, Germans, Lithuanians, Hungarians, or even Polovzes. The first appeal for help was to the Polish duke Boleslav II. the Bold, who conquered Kiev in 1069, as Boleslav I. had once done, and for the first time sacked the city. Soon, however, the threatened Isjaslav was compelled once more to give way, and his renewed appeals to the Poles for help were futile. Then in 1075 he made overtures to the Emperor Henry IV.; but the embassy of the latter failed to obtain any results in Kiev. Isjaslav, in order to leave no stone unturned, actually sent his son,

THE BEGINNING OF THE RUSSIAN NATION

Jaropolk, to Rome to Pope Gregory VII. (a course which was followed later by his second son, Sviatopolk, grand duke from 1093 to 1114).

If we reflect that the Investiture struggle was then at its height, and that the rift between Rome and the Greek Church was now too wide to be bridged, we must from the Russian standpoint condemn the conduct of Isjaslav in offering for sale in every market the honour of his country. He had not been able to induce Little Poland or Germany to lend him any help without some return, and he now went to Rome and professed himself to be a vassal of the papal chair. The Pope in gratitude nominated his son Jaropolk to be his successor. Had that nomination been accepted, a hereditary monarchy would at one stroke have been created in Russia, certainly to the country's advantage. But Isjaslav never came to the throne.

Hitherto there had not been wanting a supply of able princes and heroes of the old stamp; but they destroyed each other. Everyone knew that this meant the ruin of Russia; but no one was willing or able to prevent it. Vladimir Monomach, the son of that Wsewolod to whom, according to the distribution made by Jaroslav, the district of Perejaslav was assigned, was a man of gentle character, religious and just, but at the same time brave and shrewd. He always endeavoured to settle disputes by pacific methods, and pointed out the great ravages caused by the Polovzes. The princes finally concluded a peaceful alliance, when they met in 1097 at Lubetch by Tchernigov on the Dnieper. The source of the evil was seen to lie in the proviso that the princes, since they moved from one country to another, gradually approaching Kiev, never felt at home anywhere, but neglected their principalities. It was, therefore, decided that every Rurikovich should continue to hold his father's share. All kissed the cross of peace, and promised to defend the country, one and all, against the Polovzes.

But the rule of succession, which had become in Lubetch the law of the land, did not put an end to the civil wars. David of Volhynia, the son of Igor and grandson of Jaroslav, was at enmity with Volodar of Terebowla and Vassilko of Przemyśl, the sons of Rotislav. The princes had hardly separated when the Grand Duke Sviatopolk, in consequence of the hints of

David, enticed Vassilko to Kiev, and then surrendered him to David, who put out his eyes. The princes once more assembled in 1100 at Uwjatyci on the Dnieper, and concluded a new peace; the chief agent this time, also, was Vladimir Monomach. He was Grand Duke from 1114 to 1125, and conducted the government with vigour and justice.

Monomach's Letter of Counsel

A letter which Vladimir wrote to Oleg of Tchernigov is still extant, as also his will,

some of the chief sentences of which deserve to be quoted. "Since my end is near, I thank the All Highest that he has prolonged my days. . . . Praise the Lord, dear children, and love also your fellow-men. Neither fasting, nor solitude, nor monasticism will save you, but good deeds alone. . . . Do not always have the name of God on your lips; but if you have strengthened an oath by kissing the cross, beware of breaking it. . . . Look diligently yourselves after everything in your households, and do not trust to retainers and servants, or the guests will speak evil of your house. Be strenuous in war, setting a model to your voivodes. . . . When you travel through your country, suffer not your vassals to molest the people, but where you halt, give your meat and drink to your hosts. Above all, honour your guests, noble and lowly, merchants and ambassadors; if ye cannot give them presents, make them content at least with food and drink. For guests spread good and evil report of us in foreign lands. . . . Love your wives, but be not governed by them. . . . Keep in mind the good which ye hear, and learn that which ye do not know. My father could speak in five languages. . . . Man ought always to be occupied. When you are journeying on horseback, and have no business to transact, do not give way to idle thoughts, but repeat some prayer which you have learnt; if no other occurs to you, then the shortest and best, 'Lord have mercy upon me.' Never go to sleep without having bowed your head to the earth; but if you feel ill, bow yourselves thrice to the earth. Let the sun never find you in bed! Go early into the church to offer your matins to God; my father did so, and so did all good men. . . . After doing that they sat in council with the Druzina, or administered justice or rode to the chase. But at noon

they lay down to sleep; for God hath fixed noontide as a time of rest not only for men, but also for four-footed creatures and for birds. Thus, too, hath your father lived. I have always done personally that which I might have employed my servants to do. . . . I myself exercised supervision over the church and

The Fighting Record of Monomach divine worship, over the household, the tables, the chase, the hawks and the falcons. I have fought in

eighty-three campaigns altogether, not reckoning the unimportant ones. I concluded nineteen treaties of peace with the Polovzes. I took prisoners more than a hundred of their noblest princes and afterwards released them; more than two hundred I executed and drowned in the rivers. Who has travelled quicker than I? If I started in the morning from Tchernigov, I was in Kiev before vespers. . . .

I loved the chase, and your uncle and I have often captured wild beasts together. How often have I been brought to the ground . . . but the Lord hath preserved me. Therefore, dear children, fear neither death nor battle nor wild beasts. Be men, whatever be the destiny that God intends for you! If divine providence has destined death for us, neither father nor mother nor brother can save us. Let the hope of man be in the protection of God alone." When Vladimir Monomach died, in 1125, "all the people wept," said his contemporary Nestor.

The number of the princes fighting for the possession of Kiev grew more and more, and the position of Russia became more and more desperate. South Russia in particular could never regain tranquillity and defend itself against the wild dwellers in the steppe. It was a fortunate circumstance indeed that inveterate feuds prevailed among these latter. The western tribes, the Torkes, Berendejans, and Pechenegs, which were called collectively

Political Collapse of South Russia Chornyje Klobuki (Black Caps), were mortal enemies of the Polovzes, and therefore sided with Russia and

were settled in the country. They were soon assimilated with the Russian people, and thus brought a peculiar strain into the national characteristics of South Russia. These various nations of the steppe fought as allies of one Russian prince against others, until they all became Slavs. But as late as the sixteenth century

a tribe in the district of Skvirsh near Kiev called itself "Polovces."

The end of all this was the political and economic collapse of South Russia. A consequence of the same causes was that the princes who were excluded from the contest for Kiev shook themselves free from the supremacy of the grand duke there, and that totally independent principalities were formed. This was the case with Polock, Novgorod, Rostov, Turov, Pskov, Wjatka, and in the west with Halicz.

A powerful principality developed in the south-west of Russia, in the Dniester district. Vladimir, who had been entrusted by Jaroslav the Wise with the conduct of the campaign against Byzantium in 1043, and as prince of Novgorod had predeceased his father in 1052, had left a son, Rotislav. The latter, as the "Isgoj" [see above] having no claim to the throne of the grand duke, had to be content with Rostov. When, then, one of his uncles, Vjatcheslav of Smolensk, died, and the youngest uncle, Igor, advanced from Volhynia to Smolensk, Rotislav obtained Volhynia, while Rostov was defeated at Perejaslav. But

Poison Ends Rotislav's Adventures when Igor also died at Smolensk in 1060, and Rotislav indulged in hopes of advancing to Smolensk, and later eventually to Kiev, the uncles did not wish to make this fresh concession him. The adventurous prince, therefore, went in 1064 with his Druzina in an oblique line from the extreme west of Russia to the farthest eastern boundary, to Tmutorokan, and drove out the prince Gleb, the son of his uncle Sviatoslav of Tchernigov. As the nearest neighbour of the Byzantines, he aroused their alarm; a Katapan who was sent to him won his confidence and poisoned him in 1066.

Rurik, Volodar, and Vassilko, the sons of Rotislav, inherited a part of the Volhynian principality, Przemyśl and Terebowla; these "Chervenian towns," which had been conquered by Vladimir the Great in 981, and taken from him by Boleslav of Poland in 1018, had been won back by Jaroslav in 1031, at the time of the Polish disturbances. The Diet of Princes at Lubetch recognised their right to the towns. The efforts of the Igorid, David of Volhynia, to wrest this province from the Rotislaviches were unsuccessful. New bishoprics were formed here in the twelfth century, as, for example, in Przemyśl (1120) and Halicz (about 1157).

THE BEGINNING OF THE RUSSIAN NATION

Vladimirko, the son of Volodar, after the death of his father, his uncles, and his brother Rotislav of Przemyśl, united the whole country under his sceptre and made Halicz on the Dniester his capital. When he died in 1153 he left to his only son Jaroslav Osmomysl, who reigned until 1187, a principality stretching from the River San almost to the mouth of the Dniester. The Chronicle extols the wisdom and learning of this prince, who was a patron of culture and possessed a remarkable library. The principality of Halicz (Galicia) threatened to eclipse Kiev.

It fell to the lot of this principality, from its prominent position on the western frontier of Russia, to repel the attacks of the Hungarians under Bela III. and of the Poles, who were then torn by internal feuds. But under Vladimir, son of Osmomysl (about 1200), Roman of Volhynia, having been called in by Galician Boyars, won the country over to his side, and by this union of Volhynia with Halicz founded a dominion which was perhaps the most powerful among all the Russian

Undisputed Monarch of All Russia

states and larger than the existing Polish Empire. Roman had the throne of Kiev at his disposal, and fought with Poles, Lithuanians, and Hungarians. The Volhynian Chronicler calls him the undisputed monarch of all Russia. The expelled Vladimir sought refuge with the German Emperor. Innocent III., to whose ears the fame of Roman had come, sent an embassy to him, offering him the royal crown, and urged him to adopt Catholicism; he received, however, an unfavourable answer. The effect of the proximity of Hungary and Poland was that the Druzina of the prince, the nobility, was more prominent here than in other parts of Russia and influenced the destiny of the country. This tendency was suppressed by Roman. He is said to have ordered refractory Boyars to be quartered or buried alive. "In order to eat a honeycomb peacefully, the bees must be killed," was his favourite saying.

When Roman fell in 1205, at the battle of Zavichost, leaving behind him two infant sons, Daniel and Vassilko, interminable wars for the possession of the country broke out, and princes were tortured and hanged. Poles and Hungarians took advantage of these disturbances to seize the country. Koloman, a

son of the Hungarian king Andreas II., having married the Polish princess Salome, was placed on the throne of Halicz. Daniel had reconquered it in 1229 by dint of great efforts, and did not succeed in winning back his whole inheritance until 1239. He then chose Cholm for his residence. The estrangement of the north-west was fraught with disastrous consequences for Russia. The princes of Polock in the region watered by the Niemen and the Dwina were too weak to protect themselves, first from the Swedes and Germans, and then from the Lithuanians. It was the weakening of this region which rendered the rise of a strong Lithuanian state possible.

Novgorod also aimed at independence, but had to suffer much from the wars about Kiev. The ruling body there was the assembly of citizens (*veche*), not prince or Boyars. Novgorod was an important industrial centre and greatly influenced the history of the northern Slavs and Finns. It was in fact the cradle of Russian history. The Novgorodians were once the first and only people to resist the Varangians, whom they ultimately drove out of Russia. When Jaroslav the Wise, having been defeated by his brother Sviatopolk and the Poles, came to Novgorod and wished to cross the sea, the people of Novgorod broke up his boats, voluntarily laid a tax on themselves for war purposes, and forced him once more to resume hostilities with Sviatopolk.

Being victorious at their head, he held Novgorod in high honour, and is said to have granted a charter of privileges to the city in 1019. The people of Novgorod also always held his memory sacred. But in that busy trading town, with its hundred thousand or more inhabitants, no prince was able to exercise absolute authority, nor could any dynasty find a firm footing. The prince was obliged to take an oath that he would respect their rights and privileges. He could not pronounce any judicial sentence without the assistance of the municipal "Possadnik," and, above all, he could not bring a disputed cause before a foreign court. He could neither obtain any existing villages nor build any new ones within the municipal district. His revenue was accurately fixed.

The prince had, it is true, the right to summon the popular assemblies, which met in "the court of Jaroslav" at the

The Cradle of Russian History

Princely Power Restricted in Novgorod

sound of the tocsin. But they were more powerful than he was ; for with his small Druzina, which neither belonged to the body of citizens nor could live in the centre of the district, he was totally unable to keep the great city in check. If the prince was guilty of any misconduct, he was impeached. If he did not give satisfaction "they said farewell to him and showed him his way." When Prince Vsevolod-Gabriel, who exchanged Novgorod with Perejaslav, came back in 1132, the Wece said to him : "Thou hast forgotten thy oath to die with us, and hast sought a new principedom for thyself ; go hence whither thou wilt." The popular assembly also

Far East. Independent Druzhines travelled in search of adventure, subjugated countries, and founded colonies, as, for instance, the subsequently important Free State of Vjatka, which, like Pskov also, was governed by its assembly of citizens. The Novgorodians were esteemed good seamen ; their merchants formed a guild of their own. Novgorod played the principal part in Slavonicising the north of Eastern Europe.

The congress of princes at Lubetch, which settled the hereditary provinces to be held by the princes, had assigned the Finnish territory round Rostov to the family of Monomach. Monomach founded



MARKET DAY IN THE OLD TOWN OF HALICZ ON THE DNIESTER

summoned new princes. The princes, for this reason, were reluctant to go to Novgorod. When an archbishopric was founded there in the twelfth century, the archbishop himself was chosen by the popular assembly, which naturally deposed him if there was anything against him. The Wece decided even matters of faith.

The town, therefore, proudly styled itself "sovereign, mighty Novgorod." It was full of churches and monasteries founded by private individuals. Since the soil was sandy, the town was forced to expand, colonise, and trade far and wide, especially with Northern Europe and even with the

there on the Kliasma a town which bore his name, Vladimir. The son of Monomach, George Dolgoruki, was the first independent prince of Rostov. He soon attained his object of becoming Grand Duke in Kiev ; yet he cared more for his inheritance in the north, for Vladimir and Susdal. He removed thither the discontented population from the south ; he founded towns there, and, according to tradition, Moscow also, which is mentioned for the first time in 1147. His son Andrew Bogolubski, who became ruler in 1157, took no further interest in the south, since Kiev, he thought, had no future ; its title



HOLY MONASTERY OF THE ANNUNCIATION AND THE SIBERIAN WHARVES



THE TOWN UNDER WATER AS A RESULT OF FLOODS



NOVGOROD'S FAMOUS FAIR-CITY AS SEEN FROM THE WATER

VIEWS IN THE RUSSIAN CITY OF NIJNI NOVGOROD

of grand duke had been passed on from hand to hand eighteen times since 1125!

In the year 1169 he organised an alliance of eleven princes, at whose head he placed his son Mstislav. The latter took Kiev by storm after three days' siege and allowed it to be sacked mercilessly. A great impression was made on the whole country when the city, which was sacred in the eyes of every Russian, the mother of all Russian towns and the goal of the ambition of their princes, was captured by her own sons; many believed that the end of Russia had come.

Vanished Glory of Kiev

The glory and importance of Kiev were ended. Andrew assumed, it is true, the grand ducal title, but sent to Kiev his brother Gleb, who also bore the title of grand duke. Other heads of the princely families—those of Halicz, Smolensk, Tcherrigov—equally assumed the title of grand duke. There was, however, no doubt that the Grand Duke of Susdal-Vladimir, the conqueror of Kiev, was the true master of Russia; Vladimir on the Kliasma was destined to become the centre of the empire.

George Dolgoruki and Andrew Bogolubski had a clear insight into the heart of the matter. They wished to found a strong princely power independent of the Boyars (Druzina) and the municipality, which in later years had often disposed of the crown in the south. Father and son, therefore, showed no mercy towards the Boyars. In the north there were mostly newcomers and colonists, who were bound from the outset to adapt themselves to the new conditions. The towns, too, were new, uninfluential settlements, which became exactly what their founders wished them to become. Andrew had for this reason chosen as his residence in the district of Susdal neither Rostov nor Susdal with their old citizen assemblies, but the insignificant market town of Vladimir. An absolute monarchy was able to develop there which was capable of rescuing Russia from destruction. Andrew, it is true, was murdered by his Boyars in 1175; but his

successors resolutely carried out the policy of treating the Druzina merely as subjects.

During the calamitous civil wars the consciousness of a common Russian mother country was kept alive less by the blood relationship of the reigning princes than by the Church. In the later period the glory of Kiev also was mainly based on the fact that the oldest churches were there, especially the famous subterranean monastery, where the bones of the saints reposed, and that the supreme metropolitan resided there. If, then, Vladimir on the Kliasma was to be a serious rival of Kiev, it must receive an archbishop and magnificent churches. The princes provided both these essentials. Vladimir soon possessed a golden gate, like that of Kiev, a tithe church, several monasteries, and beautiful buildings. At the sack of Kiev valuable images, church ornaments, books and bells had been carried off to Vladimir.

But the petition to the Patriarch of Constantinople to found an archbishopric in Susdal met with no immediate success. Otherwise the power of Susdal grew stronger from year to year. Vsevolod the Great, brother of Andrew, was feared throughout Russia. But quarrels again arose among his sons, until Constantine defeated the others. After his death, in 1217, his brother George II. became Grand Duke of Vladimir. He conquered the country of the Mordvins and founded in 1221 Nijni Novgorod, from 1350 to 1390 residence of the princes of Susdal, at the point where the Oka flows into the Volga.

In 1200 three forces in Russia were struggling for victory—the princes, the nobles, and the popular assembly (*vece*). The Boyars were victorious in Halicz, the citizens in Novgorod, Pskov, and Vjatka, and the princes in Susdal; in Kiev alone the three institutions existed side by side, collectively powerless. As an inevitable consequence, instead of only one, several political centres were formed side by side in Russia.





RUSSIA UNDER THE MONGOLS

THE DEGENERATING INFLUENCE OF THE TARTAR YOKE

RUSSIA had already been weakened by internal feuds, and now the greatest calamity that had ever befallen it burst on the country. In the year 1222 the Mongols appeared in the south, and first struck a blow at the Alans, who lived to the north of the Caucasus. Terrible tidings heralded their approach. Genghis Khan had united the Mongol tribes, had conquered and plundered Northern China, Kharismia, Bokhara, Samarkand, and Northern India, and was now filled with the idea of subduing Europe. He styled himself the Scourge of God, and the Asiatics, with their inborn fatalism, seldom dared to offer resistance.

The Alans allied themselves with the Polovzes; but the Mongols brought the Polovzes over to their side by bribes, and subjugated the Alans, and after that the faithless Polovzes. The latter appeared as fugitives in Russia. The princes of Southern Russia united their forces, and the Polovzes joined them, their khan, Basti, having accepted Christianity. They determined to anticipate the enemy and attack him in the steppe. Tartar envoys then appeared in their camp, ostensibly on account of the detested Polovzes. The Russians, in their infatuation, rejected the offer of peace and put the envoys to death; they had collected more than 80,000 men. A decisive battle was fought on June 16th, 1223, on the banks of the small river Kalka, which flows into the Sea of Azov.

The Polovzes fled at the very outset, and thus forced the Russians into a retreat which degenerated into a disastrous rout. Mstislav of Kiev defended himself for three days longer in his fortified camp, but finally, from over-confidence, fell into the hands of the Tartars; six princes and seventy Boyars were left on the field of battle. Mstislav and his two sons-in-law were suffocated under planks, and the Mongols celebrated the victory by a

banquet over their dead bodies. Hardly a tenth part of the army succeeded in escaping. "A vast host pressed on its heels, plundering, murdering, and sacking the towns," so the Arab Ibn al-Athir records; "many Russian merchants banded together, packed up their valuables, and sailed in many ships to Moham-

Siege and Massacre of Riasan Khan suddenly turned back to Asia; Russia was saved. The great conqueror died in 1227, and was succeeded by his third son Ogdoi. A resolution was passed by the general assembly of the empire at Karakorum in 1235 that Russia and Europe generally should be conquered, and the supreme command was given to Batu, a grandson of Genghis Khan. A Mongol army of 500,000 men, nominally, appeared in Russia in the year 1237. The Bulgarians on the Volga offered a feeble resistance, and their capital, Bulgar, was destroyed. The Mordvins, who were of Finnish stock, joined the Tartars and became their scouts. The enemy were soon before the gates of Riasan; by the help of powerful siege-engines they took the town after five days' storming, on December 21st, and a terrible massacre ensued. The Grand Duke of Vladimir had gone northwards before the battle, but was soon overtaken and killed; Vladimir, which was defended by his sons Vsevolod and Mstislav, had already fallen on February 14th, 1238.

The whole principality of Susdal was plundered, and Kolomna, Moscow, Volo Kolamsk, Tver and Torchok were reduced to ashes. Batu was now close to Novgorod when a thaw prevented any further advance of the Mongols. On their way back they captured Kose-lok after a gallant resistance of seven weeks. In the winter of 1239 Batu marched against South Russia; the task of conquest was rendered easier for him

by the persistent feuds of the Russian princes. Daniel of Halicz seized Kiev, which he ordered his Boyar Dmitri to defend, but the latter's stubborn courage was ineffectual against the superior force. Kiev fell on December 6th, 1240, and was ruthlessly sacked; even the tombs were not spared. Batu spared the life of the brave

Russia in the Hands of the Tartars

Dmitri, an unprecedented act of grace, and kept him by his side as a military adviser. He then conquered Halicz; Novgorod alone still held out. In the higher arts of war the Russians were inferior to the Mongols, who were always mounted; the latter even employed a sort of Greek fire. Poland, Hungary, and other neighbouring kingdoms were filled with Russian fugitives. Counter measures were discussed everywhere, in Rome, Hungary, Bohemia and Germany. Men's thoughts turned to Gog and Magog, the mythical destroyers, whose appearance would signify the end of the world. Louis IX. of France made ready for a crusade.

The Tartar storm then raged over Poland, Moravia and Dalmatia. Suddenly the Asiatic tide ebbed. Russia alone remained Tartar. The fugitive princes returned, but as Tartar vassals. Attempts were begun to make the pillaged towns once more habitable, and the ruins were partially rebuilt. But the country was depopulated; men were required and they were chiefly taken from the more densely populated west. From this time dates the movement of German colonists towards the east.

Batu had long since established on the Volga an empire, almost independent of the Great Khan, called Kiptchak, or the Golden Horde, with Sarai as capital, and was now occupied with its organisation. The national code was the Yasa or customary law drawn up by Genghis Khan, which recognised only the penalty of

The Grandeur of the Khan Batu

death and corporal punishment. The oath of loyalty was taken bareheaded, kneeling and with loosened girdle.

A strict ceremonial distinguished the khan from the people. Before any man approached him, he had to pass between two fires, since poison or other dangerous things, which he might have on his person, would thus, it was supposed, be rendered harmless. No one might speak with the khan except when kneeling,

and frequently a veil was thrown over the visitor that he might not look on the face of the khan.

John de Piano Carpini, who was received in audience by Batu as ambassador of Pope Innocent IV., records: "Batu keeps a splendid court; his army numbers 600,000 men. His brothers, sons, and grandees sit below him on a bench in the middle, all others on the bare ground—men on the right, women on the left. . . . We, too, when we had delivered our message, seated ourselves on the left, as all ambassadors do; but we were placed on the right. . . . Batu never drinks in the presence of people without singing and zither-playing. When he rides, an umbrella is held over his head, as is the custom of all Tartar princes and their wives."

The residence of the khan was called Orda, hence "horde." The nation was divided on a military system into groups of tens, hundreds and thousands. A tuman, or body of ten thousand, constituted a separate province. The subject peoples had only to pay taxes, and were not under

Russian Princes Under Subjection

any other obligation. The receiver-general of taxes was called baskak (later, equivalent to extortioner or oppressor). Plano Carpini tells us that one such baskak carried off one son out of every family which had three; the same thing occurred with the unmarried men, women and all beggars. A list was made of the remaining inhabitants, and a tax levied on every human being, new-born babes of a day old included; from each a black or white bearskin, a black beaver, a sable, a marten, and a black fox. Those who could not pay were carried off into slavery.

The Russian princes were required to make personal suit to the khan that he would confirm their rank. Thus Batu summoned the Grand Duke Jaroslav of Vladimir, who had succeeded his brother George II., to appear before him at Sarai with all his family. Jaroslav was further forced to go to the Great Khan at Karakorum; there he met Plano Carpini. Jaroslav died in the desert on his way home, either from exhaustion or from poison, which he is supposed to have drunk at the court of the Great Khan (1246). The adventurous Minorite saw in the Kirghiz steppes the dried bones of the Boyars of the grand duke, who had perished of thirst in the desert. It was



GENERAL VIEW OF MOSCOW LOOKING NORTH



THE KREMLIN MOSCOW'S ACROPOLIS—SURROUNDED BY ITS GREAT WALL



THE CITY AS SEEN FROM THE KREMLIN

SCENES IN MOSCOW, THE ANCIENT CAPITAL OF RUSSIA

necessary, in order to be successful, to spend large sums on "presents" to Tartar princes, favourites and women. The unhappy Russian princes had also to face the machinations of their own people.

Daniel of Halicz, far from paying any tribute, fortified his towns and sought an alliance with the Pope after 1246.

Severe Measures of the Great Khan

But in 1250 a message came from the khan, that he was to give up Halicz. Being inadequately prepared for resistance, he went thither and humbled himself by drinking the black mare's milk (kumiss) and prostrating himself before the "great princess." He was dismissed after twenty-five days, and received Halicz back again as a fief. He nevertheless renewed his negotiations with Innocent IV., and promised to subordinate his Church to him; he received papal legates, by whom he was crowned king in 1254. But as the crusade was preached in vain, he once more broke off his relations with Rome. He was then compelled at the command of the Great Khan to raze his fortresses, and from dire necessity he bore the Tartar yoke until his death, which occurred at Cholm in 1266.

Alexander, son of Jaroslav, who had driven out the Germans, and in 1240 had conquered the Swedes on the Neva (hence the honourable title of Newskij) was then established in Novgorod. Innocent IV. sent two cardinals in 1251 to win him over to the Roman Church, but in vain. Alexander, on the other hand, went in 1254 to Sarai, accompanied by his brother Andrew, and thence to Karakorum; the journey lasted three full years. He must have obtained an overpowering impression of the Mongol power; henceforward he remained loyal to the Tartars, and even fought with his own brother Andrew on their behalf. Only a united Russia could have resisted. Batu Khan died in 1256. His son

The Hated Baskaks in Novgorod

Sertak, who was devoted to Christianity, soon followed him to the grave, probably owing to poison, and Batu's brother Berkai (or Bereke) now mounted the throne (1257). He instituted a general census and taxation throughout Russia. The hated Baskaks now appeared for the first time in Novgorod. The popular assembly was convened. The Possadnik addressed the meeting, but when he counselled submission, the people killed him.


Alexander's own son reproached his father for imposing servitude on free men. It was with the greatest difficulty that the prince induced the defiant population to allow themselves finally to be registered. In the year 1262 the towns of Vladimir, Susdal, and Rostov revolted against the Baskaks. Alexander hurried with presents to the khan, but was nevertheless detained for a year. He died on the journey home on November 14th, 1263, in consequence of his privations.

A change was then produced in the life of the Tartar people. They could not permanently disregard the influence of a higher culture. Rome made great efforts to win them by missions, especially since the Mongol world, by the destruction of Bagdad in 1258, had proclaimed itself hostile to Islam. The two recently founded orders of Franciscans and Dominicans gained a name in the Church history of the East, and undertook in particular the task of converting the Tartars. John de Plano Carpini the Minorite was not the last who sought to win the Tartar khan for the Roman faith.

The Greek Church also was not without influence. Some great khans were superficially followers of Christianity.

Kuyuk (1246-1248) had a Christian chapel near his palace; Kublai (1260-1294) regularly attended the celebration of the feast of Easter. A Greek bishopric was founded in Sarai itself. The Mongol rulers were thoroughly tolerant. Plano Carpini saw, in the camp of the Great Khan, Christians, Greek priests, and a Christian church. The Franciscan William of Rubruquis describes how Mangu Khan in 1254 arranged a discussion between the representatives of various beliefs; Christians, Mohammedans, and heathen performed their acts of worship in his presence. Priests and monks were exempt from the poll-tax; the jurisdiction of the Greek Church was confirmed; sacrilege was punishable with death. The monasteries within the dominions of the formerly abused Mongols increased in numbers and wealth.

An event of great significance then occurred; Berkai Khan turned his attention to Islam. The religious fanaticism of the Moslems then invaded Sarai, and prevented the fusion of the nations. It was one of the serious results of the miserable Fourth Crusade, which, by the



RUSSIAN SOVEREIGNS FROM 1281 TILL 1533

From a series of historic medals.

capture of Constantinople (1203) under conditions of revolting cruelty and by the partition of the empire, had crippled the power of the Greek Church and of Greek culture without aiding the West, that Mohammedanism was able to achieve so important a victory. A Byzantium of undiminished power would have all the more

**The Mongols
Adopt the
Faith of Islam**

certainly won the Tartars for the Orthodox faith, since the Greek form of worship impressed the Asiatics, and since their army, to the extent, perhaps, of three-fifths, consisted of Oriental Christians, owing to the thousands of prisoners made yearly. But a destroyed Byzantium commanded as little respect from the Tartars as the mutual hatred of the two "Christian" beliefs. The Mongols, therefore, adopted Islam, which from racial considerations at least appealed more closely to them and seemed to be politically more advantageous. The gulf between Europe and Russia was widened by the Mohammedan Tartars. Russia had now for the first time become a province of Asia in the true sense of the word.

The three centuries which Russia had spent under the Tartar yoke had determined its place in civilisation and its development. Hitherto it had stood, if not higher, at any rate not lower than many a Western state. But now its culture was so sapped and had sunk so low that, even at the present day, it has not completely recovered from the blow. The political situation, it is true, remained much in the same position; some princes were confirmed in their dominions, and self-government conceded to them.

But the excessive drain on the finances weighed so heavily on the country that it infallibly took from the people any desire to work. The humiliating treatment and the feeling of absolute impotence as regards the Great Khan could not but corrupt the ideas of the people,

**Russia's
National Pride
Destroyed**

destroy their national pride, and sap their moral fibre. This is noticeable even in the chroniclers of the Tartar age. When in the fifteenth century one prince put out the eyes of another, the Chronicle did not utter a word of blame, as it did when Vassilko was blinded. The Russian people had thus become accustomed to scenes of horror. And these outrages were a heavier burden and lasted longer than the economic downfall.

Even after half a century the widely spread influence of the Asiatic school could be felt. The son of Daniel of Halicz already kept a Tartar body-guard; the insubordination of the nobles cannot alone excuse this procedure. That same proud city of Novgorod, which had only submitted to the Baskaks with extreme reluctance, rejected Prince Michael in 1304 with the words: "We elected thee, indeed, but only on the condition that thou showest us the Jarlyk" (the warrant from the khan). Mongols were called in by Russian princes just as Pechenegs and Polovzes had been—to help them against their own people. Russians took part in the campaigns of the Tartars, who honourably gave them a share of the spoils.

The relations between Mongols and Russians rapidly became so much closer, that in the first half of the fourteenth century Tartar princes and nobles settled in Moscow. Many distinguished Russian families are of Tartar descent; but, on the other hand, we must not overlook the fact that the later Tartar immigrants were mostly descendants of Russian prisoners, so that

**The Germs
of Russia's
Unification**

we ought rather to speak of Slavonic blood among the Tartars than vice versa. Russia would almost have got over the depression had not, from time to time, fresh outbursts of savage barbarism inflicted new wounds on the country. The keen wish for liberty was thus kept alive. Russia obtained some partial successes politically. Hostilities between Russian princes were forbidden, since no one dared to wage war without the consent of the khan. A still more important point was that the grand duke, as vassal of the dreaded Mongol, enjoyed elsewhere a greater reputation than had ever been the case. We may see in this fact the germs of the subsequent unification of Russia.

Under the Tartar supremacy the place of Vladimir (in the principality of Susdal) as the residence of the grand duke and the capital of Russia, was taken by Moscow, which lay to the west of it on the small river Moskva. The grand dukes, as Nikolai M. Karamsin justly observes, while assuming the modest title of servants of the khan, became gradually powerful monarchs. By this policy the way was paved for the rise of despotic power in Russia, and the princely house, in Moscow as formerly in Vladimir, had a definite aim before its eyes. They were responsible



The Soukareff Tower



Uspenskiy Cathedral, where tsars are crowned



The Cathedral of St. Basil, built in 1551



The House of the Romanoffs



The Convent of Novo-Dievitchy, founded in 1521

HISTORIC PALACES AND CHURCHES OF MOSCOW

to the khan for the maintenance of public order in Russia, assumed, as general agents of the khan, the collection of taxes throughout Russia in order to be spared the torment of Tartar tax-gatherers, and thus were able to act unscrupulously towards their own subjects and other princes, and showed no mercy, since

Moscow Rises in Wealth and Prestige they received none themselves in Sarai. The other independent princes lost in prestige, and no less

so the popular assemblies and the nobility. Everyone from fear of the Mongol bowed before the grand dukes of Moscow. They drew from the farming of the revenue not merely financial but also political strength. The Tartar tribute was exacted by Moscow even when it was not necessary to pay it to the Tartars, and the people paid it without murmuring. Thanks to this circumstance, Moscow had always large sums of money at its disposal, and Russia in this way grew accustomed by the fourteenth century to see in it the capital of the country.

These princes of Moscow of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries were unpleasing figures, harsh, selfish, and shrinking from no steps which led to power. It is a repugnant task in these modern times to read the accounts of the degradation and meanness of most of them in their dealings with the Mongols. But it was a political necessity. Lithuania and afterwards Poland were willing to form leagues with the Tartars against Russia, and actually did so. Only such unscrupulous, unfeeling, but diplomatic rulers as the Muscovites were, could have saved Russia in its helpless and desperate plight from the Mongols and other neighbouring nations.

The first known prince of Moscow was Michael the Bold (after 1248), younger brother of Alexander Nevski. The true founder of the principedom was Nevski's son,

The First Prince of Moscow Daniel (1263-1303), who had received Moscow as an appanage. He increased his territory, founded convents, encouraged

trade, and made a good waterway on the Moskva. When he died in 1303 he left to his sons George, Danilovitch (1303-1325), and Ivan (1328-1341) a compact territory, which they still further enlarged. George was the first who, after the death of the Grand Duke Andrew Alexandrovitch of Vladimir, came forward in 1304 as a

claimant of the grand ducal title; but his second uncle, Michael of Tver, had, as the eldest of the family, a better claim to it. Both went to their over-lord at Sarai, and tried to defeat each other by bribery and intrigues.

A civil war thus broke out between Moscow and Tver, which lasted almost thirty years, revealed startling depths of baseness, and cost the life of several princes. Moscow eventually won. George, who married in 1315 Kontchaka, the favourite sister of Uzbek Khan, became grand duke. Ivan I., surnamed Kalita, from the purse which he wore in order to distribute alms, knew how to win over the Church, and to induce the Metropolitan Peter of Vladimir to settle at Moscow; Theognost, Peter's successor, also resided in Moscow, which ranked as the capital after 1328.

No Russian prince made so many journeys to the Horde as Kalita. He so completely won over the Mongols that they entrusted him with the government of the affairs of his kingdom, and even placed an army at his disposal. Peace reigned for years

Reign of Peace in Russia in Russia. The amalgamation of the two nations made rapid strides. This wise policy was

the more profitable since the mighty Uzbek (1312-1340) then sat on the throne of Kiptchak. Kalita was himself a merchant prince and in favour of Uzbek, and the wide expanse of the Mongol Empire helped the Russian trade. Ivan took upon himself the duty of levying the tribute from Russia.

The same policy was followed by his sons Simeon the Proud (1341-1353) and Ivan II. (1353-1359). Simeon even ventured to assume the title "Grand Duke of all Russia." Other times had come. The grand duke had formerly been to all other princes "father" or "elder brother," now he was for all his relations "lord" (gospodin). All had to feel the weight of his hand. When Novgorod, which had become a dependency of Moscow, tried to gain freedom, it was punished with severity, and the obligation imposed on it that in the future the municipal officials should kneel barefooted before the assembly of the princes and entreat their mercy. We notice here the influence of Mongolian customs. But the necessity for this severity is shown by the reign of Simeon's brother Ivan II., whose weakness

rendered insecure all the successes that had been achieved.

The position of Russia had meantime improved. While the Muscovite princes slowly united the Russian countries in their hands, the Mongol state began to break up. Some parts of the vast empire made themselves independent of Sarai under khans of their own, the same process which had formerly ruined Russia. The son of Ivan II., Dmitri Ivanovitch (1362-1389), was soon strong enough to defy the will of the Tartars and to govern in Russia as he thought best; in 1376 he actually made two petty Tartar princes his tributaries. When in the same year he conquered a governor of the able Manaj Khan, he exclaimed: "God is with us; their day is over!" But that was premature. Manaj collected an immense army, and at the same time concluded a treaty with the Lithuanian prince, Jagiello. Dmitri also rallied many princes round him, and strengthened himself by prayer in the Church of the Assumption, before he rode to the battlefield. All felt keenly that a religious war impended. Manaj

First Blow to the Mongol Yoke is said to have threatened to destroy all the churches and bring over Russia to Islam. The battle took place on September 8th, 1380, on the plain of Kulikovo (at the confluence of the Neprædva and the Don), and was decided in favour of Russia. Fifteen Russian princes were left on the field. Dmitri received the surname of Donskoj, the Victor of the Don. On that very day Jagiello of Lithuania had been only a few miles away from the Tartars; his junction with Manaj would certainly have changed the result. The rejoicings at this first great victory were immense; Moscow, the new capital of Russia, thus received its baptism of war. Even if the Tartar yoke was still far from being shaken off, it was yet seen that the Russians in their long servitude had not forgotten how to draw the sword for freedom and honour. They had now learnt that the Mongols were not invincible; and their courage and character were increased.

Not the less important for the unification of Russia was the enactment of Dmitri, by which primogeniture became the law of the land. The eldest son of the grand duke, not the eldest of the stock, was henceforward to succeed his father. By this law, of which we have

no details, the family disputes of the ruling house were not indeed completely ended, but, happily for Russia, were restricted. The son of Donskoj, Vasilij I. Dmitrijevitich (1389-1425), now succeeded in accordance with this law of succession. Under Vasilij's successor, Vasilij II. Vasiljevitch (1425-1462), a dispute once more broke out between the supporters of the old rule of "Seniority" and the new rule of "Primogeniture." George

Great Prize in the Contest of Humility

Dmitrijevitich was opposed to the grandson of Dmitri Donskoj, the uncle to the nephew. The ambassador sent from Moscow saved the cause of his master at Sarai by a speech which throws a flood of light upon the situation. "All powerful Tsar," so Vsevoloshkij in 1431 addressed Ulugh Mahmet, "allow me to speak, who am the Grand Duke's slave. My master, the Grand Duke, solicits the throne of the Grand Duchy, which is entirely thy property, without any other claim thereto but through thy good will, thy consent, and thy warrant. Thou disposest of it as thou thinkest fit. The prince George Dmitrijevitich, his uncle, on the other hand, claims the Grand Duchy according to the enactment and last will of his father, but not as a favour of thy omnipotence."

The speech did its work; the khan commanded that George should henceforward lead his nephew's horse by the bridle. "Thus the prize in this contest of humility was assigned to the prince of Moscow." At Vasilij's coronation (such ceremonies have always taken place at Moscow since that day) a Mongolian Baskak was present. Vladimir, the old capital, now lost the last trace of its glory. The war between uncle and nephew was continued in spite of the decision of the khan. It was then seen how dependent the people were on their prince. When Vasilij, ousted by his uncle,

Departed Glory of Vladimir

had Kostroma assigned him as residence, the Muscovites left their city in crowds and joined him at Kostroma; the uncle, who could not maintain his position in Moscow, now voluntarily withdrew. And when Vasilij II. entered Moscow for a second time, the people thronged round him "like bees round their queen," says a chronicler. He died, blinded in 1446 by a son of George (hence called Temnyi), on March 17th, 1462.



THE RULERS OF RUSSIA FROM 1584 TILL 1762
From a series of historic medals.

EASTERN
EUROPE TO
THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION



RUSSIA
III

THE MONARCHS OF MOSCOW AND THE DAWN OF BETTER DAYS FOR RUSSIA

THE fall of the Tartar power rendered the consolidation of Russia possible. The unerring persistent policy of the Muscovite princes was destined to bear good fruit. Their aim was to shake off the Tartar yoke and to "join" all countries formerly Russian—that is to say, to reunite them in one empire. Ivan III. (1462-1505), who now mounted the throne as "sole monarch," his son Vasilij III. (1505-1533), and his grandson Ivan IV. (1533-1584), surnamed the Terrible, effected this junction of Russia, although they were the reverse of heroic soldiers.

Ivan III., the most important among them, was the model of a Susdalian and Muscovite ruler, a cold, heartless and calculating statesman. His policy was markedly influenced by his second marriage with Sophia (Zoë), a niece of the last Byzantine emperor, who had been educated in Rome at the papal court. Cardinal Bessarion (the humanist and advocate of the union of the Churches), had first prompted that alliance. The proposal in question reached the grand duke, then twenty years old, in 1469, and had been received by the Boyars with enthusiasm. In the year 1472 Sophia entered Moscow accompanied by many of her countrymen and by the papal legate Antonio, and her arrival brought a new spirit into the Russian court. She it was who realised the humiliation of the Mongol yoke. Moscow regarded itself now as the heir of Byzantium, and Ivan adopted the double-headed Byzantine eagle as the new arms of Russia. The outlook of Russian policy widened; henceforward Russia was regarded as the representative and seat of orthodoxy. Moscow took up the cause of the Greek Christians in the East and actually waged war in the name of this idea, which was translated into deeds against the Ottomans in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The

Pope, indeed, when he sent the fair daughter of the Palæologi to Russia, was intent on the plan of winning the whole of Russia for Rome; but the cunning of the Russian sovereign frustrated such intentions. Ivan derived all possible advantages from that alliance without conferring the slightest benefits in return.

The entry of the Roman legate into Moscow was a humiliation for Rome; he was forced to put aside the silver crucifix, which he wished to be borne in front of him, and to face an argument with a learned Russian monk, which only caused him annoyance. Even the young Greek princess, once arrived on Russian soil, seemed to have forgotten her Roman education and her papal benefactor.

It was Sophia also who taught her husband "the secret of despotism." Ivan came forward now in a quite different character from the earlier grand dukes. He stood before the eyes of the Russians like an avenging deity, and was called not only the "Great" but the "Awful" (gnosnyi; the surname of "Terrible" suits Ivan IV. better). He inflicted death penalties and martyrdoms lavishly. When he slept after meals, the Boyars anxiously kept watch by him; women fainted at his gaze. He treated foreign potentates with almost Oriental presumption. When the Mongol Khan Ahmed sent envoys with his portrait, in order to demand the tribute, he stamped on the portrait, and ordered all the envoys to be killed except one who was to carry the tidings to Astrakhan. He communicated with the Mongol envoys only through officials of the second rank.

In a word, the bearing of the grand duke testified to unbounded pride of sovereignty. He governed without the Boyars; when one of them complained that the grand duke decided every point alone, he was beheaded. Herberstein asserts that no monarch in Europe was so

implicitly obeyed by his subjects as the Grand Duke of Russia. This self-consciousness of the Russian court often, indeed, amounted to an absurdity, and barbarous customs considerably detracted from the magnificence which was displayed at the reception of foreign embassies. Ivan carried on the work of uniting Russia in the most unscrupulous manner. He began by entering into a series of contracts with his relations, in order to secure the supremacy to himself. He then put an end to the more or less independent petty principalities and lordships which existed round Moscow. Thus, in the first years of his reign, Tver, Vereja, Rjasan, and then Bjelosersk, Rostow, Jaroslav, were placed under the immediate government of Moscow.

The union of Novgorod with Moscow cost much bloodshed. This once powerful free city on the Ilmen, the cradle of the Russian state, brought on its own fall by internal factions. The princes of Moscow had long been indignant that Novgorod barred their access to the sea, and also entertained the suspicion that it might join their enemies, Lithuania or Poland. Its freedom must, therefore, be crushed; it was not enough that, having long recognised the suzerainty of the lords of Moscow, it paid them tribute without difficulty; its self-government was to be taken away.

Ivan understood how to form a political party out of the supporters of the Greek faith in Novgorod, and to play them off against the others, who were devoted to the Catholic cause, and therefore to Poland. The Lithuano-Polish party was led by the Borecki family, whose head was Marfa, the energetic widow of a former Possadnik. Ivan waited until Novgorod was guilty of a breach of faith by opening negotiations with Poland, in order to seek protection there against the attacks of Russia. The Muscovite army then entered the territory of Novgorod and defeated the untrained Novgorodian troops, who had been collected with great difficulty, in 1471 at the river Schelona.

The Novgorodians submitted, recognised Ivan as sovereign, and actually accepted the jurisdiction of the courts of Moscow. But in 1478 Ivan took from them the rest of their self-government, deported the

most famous families into the interior of Russia, sent his governors to Novgorod, and brought to Moscow the bell which for centuries had summoned the people to the popular assembly. The fall of Novgorod has often been sung by the poets and made the subject of drama, Marfa Borecki being celebrated as the heroine. But no one will deny that the republic outlived its day, that it never properly fulfilled its duty as a middleman between the merchants of the East and West, and that it now really stood in the way of the union of Russian countries. The capture of Novgorod and its environs gave Moscow an overwhelming superiority over the other principalities.

Besides this, Ivan conquered Perm, "the land of silver beyond the Kama." The second free city, Viatka, was conquered in 1489; an advance was made to the Petchora, the Ural was crossed, and the country of the Voguls and Ugrians made tributary. Russia thus expanded as far as the Arctic Ocean, and for the first time set foot in Asia. Vasilij III. then subjugated the free state of Pskov, where

Ivan's Series of Conquests the dissensions of the citizens had opened the ground for him; many families were sent thence to other towns.

"Alas, glorious and mighty Pskov, wherefore this despair and these tears?" exclaims the poetical chronicler. "How shall I not despair?" answered Pskov. "An eagle with the claws of a lion has swooped down on me. . . . Our land is wasted, our city ruined, our marts are destroyed, our brethren led away whither neither our fathers nor grandfathers dwelt." But subordination to Moscow was for Pskov an historical necessity if the unification of Russia was to progress. When Vasilij had banished the princes of Rjasan and Novgorod Severskij and united their lands with Moscow, the union of European Russia under the leadership of Moscow would appear almost finished. Russia already directed her eyes toward newly discovered Asiatic districts, where the Arctic Ocean formed the frontier. Only the Lithuanians and the Tartars were still left to be conquered.

Ivan III. had the good fortune to shake off the Tartar yoke. There were then several Tartar kingdoms—Kasan, Astrakhan (Sarai), the Nogai Horde, the province of the Crimea, and numerous smaller independent hordes—who all fought with

THE MONARCHS OF MOSCOW

each other, and thus lightened the task of the grand duke. In the year 1480 Ivan advanced with a strong army against the great horde of Sarai, but could not make up his mind to strike; for months the two armies stood opposite each other in inaction, until at last the Tartars withdrew. It was not therefore a great victory; Russia had only ceased to pay tribute. Once again, in the year 1521, the Tartars of the Crimean horde united with their tribesmen beyond the Volga in the Nogai steppe and in Kasan, to attack Moscow. The town was so suddenly invested on all sides that the Grand Duke Vasilij hardly made good his escape. The citizens in their first panic promised to pay again the old tribute. Then discord broke out among the Tartars; they withdrew.

From that time the Tartar danger was as good as ended. But another Mohammedan power, Turkey, threatened Russia from the south; in 1475 Mohammed II. brought the Crimea under his suzerainty. At the same time a growing danger arose in the union of Poland with Lithuania. How could Russia have withstood this powerful neighbour if she had been still politically divided, and dependent on Tartar hordes? It was the merit of the grand dukes of Moscow that a liberated and united Russia could not only defend itself, but could also advance victoriously against the menacing foe.

The prestige of Moscow grew not only in all Russian districts, but also in foreign countries. The courts of Western Europe sought to win the alliance of the grand duke. Apart from their relations to Rome, Lithuania and Poland, Ivan III. and his son Vasilij received envoys from Venice, Hungary, the Emperor Frederic III. and his son Maximilian, Sweden and Denmark. From the East came envoys from Turkey, Georgia and Persia. Russia now found the leisure and also experienced the desire to devote time to the work

of civilisation. Just as when formerly the Grand Duke Vladimir married the Greek princess, Anna, the art and religion of Byzantium were transplanted with her to Russia, so the second wife of Ivan and her Greek suite now called a new age of culture into life. Byzantine scholars brought Greek books with them, which formed the nucleus of the later libraries of Moscow. Ivan III. himself took pleasure in distinguished foreigners:

**Ivan's Wife
Introduces
Culture**

Artists and scholars from Western Europe found a brilliant reception at Ivan's court. In Aristotele Fioraventi of Bologna he acquired a distinguished architect, artillerist, and tutor for his children. Pietro

Antonio built a palace for him. Monks from the famous monastery of Athos came to Russia; amongst them a learned Greek, Maxim by name, was conspicuous. He is said to have been astonished to find such a mass of old manuscripts in the Kremlin at Moscow. The monks were entrusted by the grand duke with the translation of Greek books into Slavonic. The grand dukes owed their successes against the Tartars and petty princes partly to the artillery perfected by foreigners. The whole system of warfare was revolutionised. At the same time mineral treasures were exploited. Ivan III. also devoted attention to the judicial



IVAN III. "THE AWFUL"

Cold, heartless and calculating, Ivan III. stood before the Russians like an avenging deity, and lavishly inflicted death penalties and martyrdoms. During his reign, from 1462 till 1505, the prestige of Moscow greatly extended.

system, which in the Tartar age was often a matter of caprice, and in 1497 caused the common law to be published in the new Russian code Sudebnik.

The question of the succession, that open wound from which Russia so long bled, and to which she formerly owed her subjugation, was at last settled. The testamentary dispositions of Ivan III. showed his opinion on the point. After he had long hesitated whether to nominate as his successor his grandson or his son by his second wife, he decided in favour of his son Vasilij, probably because his mother was a Byzantine. The other sons received small provinces without

monarchical rule; they had neither the right of coinage, nor any higher jurisdiction, and were compelled to recognise the elder brother as their lord. If one of them died without issue, his lands reverted to the grand duke. Thus the first hereditary monarchy was instituted in Russia. An era of renaissance now began for Russia—

The Dawn of a Great Glory a restoration of the political independence and union of the empire, an economic revival, an awakening of the national self-consciousness, a renewal of national culture and literature, the dawn of new and greater glory. Russia, by frequently sending embassies to foreign courts, entered by degrees into the circle of the civilised nations of the West. In short, fortune once more smiled on Russia.

But the goal was still far away, and serious obstacles remained to be overcome. The people were now the greatest obstacle to themselves. In the long period of Tartar rule they had been warped not merely politically but morally. The Russians had emerged from the Asiatic school, in which they had so long been trained, as Asiatics accustomed to murder and cruelty. The Greek Church in Russia had suffered equally; left to itself it inevitably became stagnant. It is easier to improve the national welfare and culture and to gain victories than to change the nature of a whole people; several generations at least are required for that.

The hard fortunes of the country had produced a hard ruling dynasty. The pride and self-consciousness of the sovereign, in whose person the state was bound up, grew with the progress which the union of Russia made under Moscow's supremacy, with the increase of the royal power as compared with the nobility and the popular assembly, and with the growth in the power and prestige of the nation. In Moscow the contest between the power of

Ivan "The Terrible" on the Throne the prince and that of the nobility and the popular assembly, which raged throughout Russia, had been decided in favour of the former. It was a soil on which tyranny might flourish. The Susdalian and Muscovite princes had increased the strictness of their government, and while Ivan III. had already earned the surname of "Awful," this stamp of sovereign reached the climax in Ivan IV. History calls him "The Terrible." A man of unusual gifts

and iron will, but of the worst education imaginable, he is one of the most wonderful phenomena in history, in which he has acquired a dark notoriety. It would be unfair to condemn him at once; he is too important to be measured by conventional standards.

When he was only three years old his father died. The government during his minority was taken over by his mother, Helene Glinska, a Lithuanian, whose family was originally Tartar. A council of Boyars, in which the first place was ceded to her uncle Michael Glinski, was placed at her side. But it was soon apparent that this ambitious woman would not tolerate any other will by the side of hers. Only her favourite, Count Ivan Telepnev Obolenskij, could exercise any influence over her. A reign of bloodshed began. Her brother-in-law George, her uncle Michael, her second brother-in-law Andrew, and others who seemed dangerous to her, died a cruel death, while the affairs of the empire were not maladministered externally. When Helene died suddenly in 1538, and the Boyar council alone under-

Untamed and Plundering Boyars took the conduct of state affairs, two families, the Schujskij and the Bielskij, came forward, disputed for precedence, and fought each other. Once more there were scenes of blood; no quarter was given by either side when it had the upper hand. Russia had now been so long accustomed to self-government that even in the Privy Council a member would wish to have unrestricted liberty of language. The fact that no regard was shown the successor to the crown in the matter, and that he would have been gladly ignored, shows how untamed the powerful Boyars then were. Even in later years Ivan complained that Ivan Schujskij had not greeted him, and in his bedroom had placed his feet on his father's bed, that the treasury of his father and his uncle had been plundered by the Boyars, and that even the royal service of plate had been marked with their names.

Ivan in those days often suffered hunger; even his life was threatened. The Schujskij attacked towns and villages, tormenting and extorting without mercy. They jealously watched that no one else gained influence. One of the privy councillors, Fedor Voronzov, who seemed to rejoice in the favour of the young sovereign, was insulted and cuffed in the presence of the latter; his clothes were

THE MONARCHS OF MOSCOW

torn, and he would have been killed had not the metropolitan rescued him at Ivan's petition. Prematurely accustomed to barbarity and bloodshed, the twelve-year old boy gloated over the agonies of tortured animals; when only fifteen years old, he rode through the streets of Moscow with his young companions and cut and slashed all he met.

The Orthodox Greek Church, which might have been expected to exercise a favourable influence on the lawless youth, had sunk into such decay under the Mongol yoke, that it had not the strength to interfere. The clergy were almost as addicted to gaming, drunkenness, and other vices, as the laity; the darkest superstition prevailed among the common people. Impostors, robbers, and fanatics roamed the land; murder and brigandage were everyday occurrences. This was the normal condition of the society in which Ivan the Terrible grew up.

At first he submitted, until, in 1543, in blazing fury he had Prince Andrew Schujskij seized in the open street, subjected to gross indignities, and murdered.

Moscow in Ashes From that day, says the Chronicle, the Boyars began to fear him. He was then thirteen years old. On February 3rd, 1547, when barely seventeen years old, he married Anastasia, daughter of the chamberlain, Roman Sacharin. It is a proof of his political insight that he assumed the title of tsar, and that he obtained in 1561, personally through the Patriarch of Constantinople, as well as through a council expressly called for the purpose, a confirmation of his descent from the imperial Byzantine house and of his right to the imperial crown.

Fear fell on all pagan countries, says the Chronicle of Novgorod. All the nations of the Orthodox East began to look to the Muscovite tsar as to the head and representative of their Church and their patron. In the year of his coronation three outbreaks of fire (April and June, 1547) reduced the city of Moscow to ashes. The lives of the tsar and the metropolitan were in the greatest danger. The Schujskij princes spread the report that the tsar's grandmother, Anna Glinska, had torn the hearts out of corpses, soaked them in water, sprinkled the streets of Moscow with them, and thus caused the fire. The excited populace murdered the uncle of Ivan, George Glinska, in the church,

marched to Vorobjovo, where the tsar was staying, and demanded with threats the surrender of his grandmother. The mob did not disperse until Ivan, acting on a bold impulse, had the spokesman executed. The occurrence is said to have made a weighty and lasting impression on the tsar. It was then that Ivan drew two men

The Good Influence of Pope Silvester

to his side, the Pope Silvester and a court official, Alexis Adashev. Silvester governed him completely. Ivan did not venture on a step without Silvester; he ate, drank, dressed and lived according to Silvester's doctrines. The influence of the two was very beneficial, and not less so that of his wife Anastasia. An honourable atmosphere prevailed in court circles; in all state business, moral and religious aspects came into the foreground. Synods and imperial assemblies were summoned, in order to discuss important business. It was an inspiring moment when the young tsar, in the year 1549, asked forgiveness from the assembled people for all injustice, and humiliated himself. He showed universal courtesy and commanded men's trust and love. Much good was really done then. In 1556 a new code of civil and canon law appeared, which from its division into one hundred chapters was called Stoglaw. Its sixteenth paragraph contained an enactment for the erection of parochial schools in every town.

At the same time the court of Moscow resolved to carry on war against the Tartars on the Volga, who still harassed Russia. Ivan, at Silvester's advice, though reluctantly, placed himself at the head of the army. Kasan was taken in 1552, not so much by the bravery as by the sheer numerical superiority of the Russians. In the year 1557, Astrakhan, the old Sarai, once so formidable to Russia, also fell. The results of this first conquest at the cost of the Asiatics were far-reaching. Not merely was the power of the Tartars

Power of the Tartars Crushed

crushed and the whole of the great Volga made a Russian stream, but Russian influence now reached into the Caucasus as far as Persia. Other tribes, such as the Tcheremisses, Mordvins, Tchuvashes, Votiaks, Bashkirs, who had formerly been subject to the ruler of Kasan, now made their submission. The first step towards the conquest of Asia was taken. The Crimean horde alone was left; but it led a precarious existence and sought the

alliance of Russia. Ivan returned to Moscow as a hero. His confident attitude towards the Boyars increased. "I fear you no longer," he is said to have exclaimed to a voivode.

He resolved at this period to disseminate the culture of Western Europe in Russia. Hans Slitte, a German from Goslar, who was at Moscow in 1547, was commissioned by him to bring scholars, artists, physicians, printers, artisans, etc., to Russia. And it was only in consequence of the hostile attitude of the Livonians, who saw in this plan a dangerous strengthening of their neighbour, that Slitte failed to bring to Russia the 123 persons whom he had engaged. From this moment the dislike Ivan felt for the Baltic Germans grew the more intense, since the Teutonic Order in Livonia barred his road to the sea. From these reasons the determination to conquer Livonia matured in his mind despite the warnings of Silvester and Adashev.

When in 1553, under Edward VI., a British expedition of three ships was sent to explore the route to China and India by the Arctic Ocean, and one of the ships was cast away at the mouth of the Dwina, Ivan seized the opportunity of opening commercial negotiations with England. He conceded to the English merchants highly advantageous trading privileges, and thus secured to his empire a connection with the West. In the war for Livonia, which broke out between Russia, Poland, and Sweden, Ivan obtained only Dorpat (1558), while Poland held Livonia as a province and the duchy of Courland as a fief. Esthonia fell to Sweden. These events entirely broke off the friendly relations between Ivan and Adashev and Silvester. The death of his virtuous queen (August 7th, 1560) certainly contributed to this result. The guardianship exercised over him by the two men had at last become intolerable. Silvester had tried to make his master quite dependent on him, and had even taken up a position of hostility to the tsaritsa.

Russia's Share of the Spoils of War

When the first son of the tsar died (June, 1553), Silvester declared to him that it was a punishment inflicted by heaven for his disobedience. But a severe illness of the tsar, about the end of the year 1552-1553, had brought matters to a head. Awaiting his end, Ivan called on the Boyars to do homage to his son Dmitri. But the Boyars refused; Silvester and Adashev sided with the rebels. The noise of the disputants reached the sick chamber of the tsar.

Treason Against the Tsar

When Ivan, contrary to expectation, recovered, his confidence in his two councillors was gone. Ivan was as yet moderate in his punishments; but little by little the number of executions increased, until his fury against the Boyars knew no bounds. The fallen ministers had many partisans; and when Ivan later scented treason everywhere, and felt himself insecure in his own court, he was to some extent justified. Lithuania-Poland, the most dangerous enemy of Russia, kept up communications with the malcontents, and the party of the fallen made no disguise of their Polish proclivities. Prince Andrew Kurbskij intentionally brought about a shameful defeat in the Livonian campaign, and fled in 1564 to the Polish camp. Others actually admitted Tartars into the



"THE TERRIBLE" IVAN IV.

It was not without reason that this significant name, "The Terrible," came to be applied to Ivan IV. But he was the first ruler to encourage British merchants to trade in Russia, and was thus nicknamed "The English Tsar."

country. Ivan's anxiety now became a disease; he believed himself to be surrounded by none but traitors.

He at this time received a letter from the fugitive Kurbskij, in which the latter summoned him before a divine tribunal to answer for his cruelties. Ivan sent for the bearer of the letter, drove his iron-shod staff through his foot, leant with all his weight on it, and then had the letter read out. Rarely have more stinging reproaches been hurled in the face of a sovereign. The tsar thought well to answer the letter at length.

Both writings belong to the most remarkable documents of Russian history. Ivan suddenly left Moscow on December



THE METROPOLITAN PHILIP REFUSING TO BLESS IVAN THE TERRIBLE

Both for good and evil, Ivan IV., known as "The Terrible," occupies a prominent place in Russian history. Singling out a series of towns and some streets in Moscow, he declared them to be his own private property. The Metropolitan Philip was bold enough to protest, and refused his blessing to the tsar. Ivan, in hot rage, summoned an ecclesiastical court, and from the steps of the altar, on November 8th, 1568, Philip was dragged off to a convent prison, where he was strangled the following year. Ivan's reign lasted for fifty-one years—from 1533 till 1584.

3rd, 1564, in the company of his family, many Boyars, and an armed force, and went to Alexandrovskaja Sloboda. He took the most revered relics and the state treasure with him. Moscow was wildly excited. A month afterwards two missives from him arrived—one to the metropolitan, in which he said that he could no longer tolerate the illegalities of the Boyars, especially since the clergy hindered him from punishing them, and that he had resolved to leave the empire and go whither God led him; a second was addressed to the Orthodox citizens of Moscow, in which he assured them that he was not angry with them.

The impression produced by these two letters was overwhelming. The people, filled with the fear of falling again under the rule of the nobles, marched with lamentations and threats through the streets of the city, ready to cut down the tsar's enemies, and requested the metropolitan to propitiate the tsar; whereupon an embassy to the tsar was organised.

Ivan came back on February 2nd, 1565. But a terrible change would seem to have taken place in him. "His mere aspect struck horror; his features were distorted with fury, his sight nearly gone, his hair almost all fallen off. He declared before a great meeting that he needed a body-guard." He then singled out a series of towns and some streets of Moscow, and declared that to be his private property, which was called Opritshina, while the rest of Russia as state property was called Semshtshina, and was left under the management of the council of Boyars. This was the first separation of crown property from national property, and was important in its consequences.

He chose out of his own lands a body-guard of 6,000 men with wives and children, mostly people of low origin, the Opritshniki. An axe, a dogshead, and a besom were their badges, signifying that traitors would be beheaded, gnawed to pieces, and swept away. The whole Semshtshina was assigned to them to plunder, and there was no appeal to justice against them. How they wreaked their fury is shown by the circumstance that even now in Russo-Polish countries a vagabond and robber is called "opryszok." Ivan meantime executed the traitors unsparingly, and then retired to Alexandrovo.

There he indulged in wild excesses, in brutal man-hunts, murdering, and burning. Strangely enough, he combined with all this sincere religious observances, arranging his court as a convent, and forming out of 300 trustworthy myrmidons a monastic brotherhood, of which he was abbot. He performed every duty and himself rang the bell for service. At midnight they assembled in cowls and black gowns, and Ivan struck his forehead so hard upon the floor that his face was covered with bruises.

This state of things lasted until 1572, for seven full years. Ivan was meantime conscious of the disgracefulness of these proceedings, for he endeavoured to disguise to the outside world the existence of the Opritshniki, and conducted the affairs of state as before. The Metropolitan Philip finally plucked up courage to ask him to abolish the Opritshina. Ivan, however, summoned an ecclesiastical court and impeached the bold petitioner. While Philip was standing in full robes before the altar on November 8th, 1568, a troop of the bodyguard rushed in, tore the vestments from him, and dragged him

off to a convent prison, where he was strangled in 1569. The public mourning for the metropolitan reduced Ivan to fury. Hundreds of persons were daily executed, burnt, or tortured to death, and whole communities were annihilated.

Ivan lived under the delusion that for the sake of his own and his family's existence he must exterminate the traitors. In the year 1572, tormented by fear and anxiety, the monarch, who in his soul was intensely unhappy, made his will: "My body is exhausted, my spirit gloomy; the ulcers on my soul and my body are spreading, and no physician is there to heal them. I waited if any would wish to have pity on me, but none came to me. . . . They have returned good with evil, love with hate." These are his words at the opening of this document. We now have an insane person before us. He seems to have been stung by qualms of conscience in his lucid intervals, as is seen from many indications.

A most remarkable and historically unique record of the tsar is left us in the shape of a book of masses for the souls of the deceased drawn up by his own hand, in which he instituted masses for each one of his victims. After several names stands the sinister note, "with his

THE MONARCHS OF MOSCOW

wife, his children and servants," "with his sons," or "with his daughters." Or we read there "twenty men from Komen-skoje," "eighty-seven from Matvejschevo," "Lord be gracious to the souls of Thy servants, 1,505 persons from Novgorod," and so on. This list alone gives a total of 3,470 victims. There was no one now at court who would have had any influence on Ivan. His second wife, a Tcherkess, who was only baptised just before her marriage, may well have increased Ivan's evil propensities by her barbarous nature.

Thus, then, the torrent, having once left its banks, rushed on, destroying all in its course. Since the time of the Roman Cæsars hardly any sovereign can have proved so clearly as Ivan the Terrible the truth of the doctrine that every human being and all earthly power require some restriction, if they are to remain within the pale of humanity. But the Russian people share the guilt with him; especially are the nobility and clergy to blame, since they did not support the efforts of the monarch in the cause of culture, but by cringing and immorality paved the way for his wicked

Tragedies in the Royal Household propensities. The last liberties of the people were destroyed, and the omnipotence of the crown established for all future time.

The foreign policy was successful in the East; the Cossack Jarmak laid the crown of Siberia at Ivan's feet. But in the contest with Poland he was worsted, notwithstanding that, under the pretext of wishing to receive the Roman faith, he humbly begged the emperor and Pope to intervene. The Poles, who were ready to offer him the crown after the death of Sigismund Augustus, were deterred by his untrustworthiness and his avarice.

Fate brought grievous misfortunes on his own house. In a quarrel he struck his son Ivan such a blow with an iron rod that the prince died from it on November 19th, 1581. His third son, Feodor, was of weak intellect. Ivan's remorse hastened his end. This remarkable prince, whose crimes are not devoid of some greatness, but whose name must always be mentioned with a shudder, died on March 17th, 1584. Ivan IV. holds a prominent place in Russian history both for good and for evil.

Ivan's son Feodor mounted the throne in 1584; but his gentleness and piety would have been more suitable for a

convent. The whole power thus lay in the hands of the privy councillors, amongst whom existed a dangerous rivalry between a Schujskij and a Bielskij. The reputation of Boris Godunov at the same time was slowly increasing, more especially since Nikita Romanof, Feodor's uncle, who was at first the most influential regent,

Ivan's Weak Son Mounts the Throne

had died in 1586, and Godunov had contrived a marriage between his sister and the young tsar; in fact, he aimed at the crown himself. Although he could neither read nor write, he skilfully conducted the business of the nation, won a great reputation for Russia in foreign countries, and appreciated the value of Western European culture. He proposed to found schools and in Moscow a university, and sent John Kramer to Germany to obtain professors for it. He sent young Russians abroad to study, and gladly employed foreigners in his service; began giving an excellent education to his children and supported art and industries.

In a word, Godunov was thoroughly capable of performing his task. His name, therefore, had a good reputation in foreign countries, but not so in Russia. There men regarded his innovations with disapproval. The clergy despised the acquisition of foreign languages as superfluous, confusing and dangerous to the faith. The great nobles muttered against the upstart. Godunov found himself compelled to look for support to the higher clergy and smaller nobility. Two important innovations owe their inception to this circumstance—the prohibition of freedom of movement of the peasants, and the founding of the patriarchate. The Russian peasant had hitherto been allowed to change his master; that alone differentiated him from a slave. But this liberty of migration only benefited the owners of extensive properties, who held out enticing advantages to the peasant in order to be

Liberty of Peasants Restricted

able to cultivate their broad plains. The peasantry, therefore, deserted the small proprietors, whose lands became depopulated and depreciated; yet these latter sustained the chief state burdens. Thus in this case the interests of the state coincided with those of the lesser nobility. Godunov, by taking from the peasant the right of movement, saved the lesser nobility from misery and gained it for his purposes. That must have been far

from his own interest, since he was himself the owner of extensive landed estates.

What was really for his personal advantage was the founding of the patriarchate. The Russian clergy had long complained that its supreme head, the Patriarch of Constantinople, was the servant

The Protector of Orthodox Christianity

of an infidel monarch and possessed no proper prestige.

Moscow regarded herself as the third Rome, just as Byzantium had thought herself the second. Why should Moscow not obtain ecclesiastical independence, now that Constantinople had fallen so low, and Russia was reckoned the protector of Orthodox Christianity? Just then Jeremias, Patriarch of Constantinople, came to Moscow. Godunov seized

the opportunity to win him over to his scheme. The other patriarchs assented, and in 1598 was founded in Moscow the patriarchate which continued until the end of 1700. The first patriarch was Job, a favourite of Godunov.

Even now Godunov seems to have made all preparations for gaining the throne after the death of Feodor. But a brother of Feodor, Dmitri, son of the seventh unlawful wife of Ivan the Terrible, was still living. Although he had been sent in good time to Uglitch with all his relations, there was no room for doubt that he would mount the throne

after the death of Feodor. The news then arrived (1591) that the young Dmitri was no more. Public opinion incriminated Godunov. It is true that he organised an investigation and executed the inhabitants of Uglitch; but the rumour persisted.

Nevertheless Boris Godunov mounted the throne of the tsar after the death of the childless Feodor (January 7th, 1598), since the crown was offered him by the Patriarch Job, and he had been elected in a sort of imperial assembly. In order to ensure his own safety, he threw Bielskij into prison and banished the Romanofs. One of them, Feodor Nikititsch, was compelled to become a monk under the name of Philaret; his wife, Xenia

Schestov, took the veil as the nun Marfa. Boris was at first an admirable ruler. But soon he was overcome by fears; he, too, saw himself surrounded by traitors. He completely lost his balance of mind when the news spread that Dmitri was still alive, and was preparing to recover the throne. Lithuanian magnates undertook to put a person who styled himself the miraculously rescued Dmitri on the Russian throne by force of arms. The people believed that Dmitri was the true tsarevitch. The troops wavered in their loyalty, and, in spite of the reverse which was inflicted on the pretender, his adherents increased in numbers.

Godunov died in 1605, in the middle of this movement, and the pseudo-Dmitri

became master of Russia. The whole nation shed tears of joy at seeing the son of their prince once more. His behaviour and sympathies showed that he was no Rurikovich. He doted on the West and on the Roman Church, he associated with Jesuits, and wished to convert Russia to Catholicism. He ridiculed the native customs and the Boyars, and scorned the court ceremonial. The Polish nobles who came to Moscow with their retinue indulged in shameless behaviour towards the Russians. A month hardly had elapsed before Dmitri fell victim to a conspiracy (May 17th,



MICHAEL III. THE FIRST ROMANOV
When Michael III. was called to rule in 1613 a new dynasty mounted the Russian throne. It was a time of severe crisis, and Michael, physically weak and of small intellectual endowments, was not the necessary strong man.

1606). His corpse was burnt, and a cannon loaded with the ashes, which were then scattered to the four winds.

The succeeding period was full of disturbances. In a new assembly, summoned by the patriarch, Vasilij Schujskij, who had conducted the inquiry in Uglitch, had

struck the pretender, and had the courage to tell him he was an impostor, was elected tsar.

Since a new patriarch had been installed by the pseudo-Dmitri, a change now took place in this office. The assembly imposed on the new tsar the condition that he was not to punish any offender by death without a trial, nor confiscate the property of criminals.

THE MONARCHS OF MOSCOW

and that false accusers should be liable to penalties. These formed a charter or constitution, such as the Slachta had extorted from the Polish king. Schujskij solemnly swore to it. But Russia saw in it a weakening of the royal dignity. The dominion of the nobility was feared more than the tyranny of the tsar.

Schujskij could not hold his own. Not merely were the nobility opposed to him from jealousy and envy, but new pretenders cropped up who professed to be Dmitri, or Peter, Feodor's son. A more dangerous symptom was that the King of Poland came forward as a serious candidate for the Russian crown. In 1587 the Swedish house of Vasa attained the Polish throne in the person of Sigismund III.

It was wished to procure the Russian crown for his son, Vladislav; Sigismund would certainly have liked to obtain it for himself. The Polish troops, which were already in the vicinity of Moscow, did not wish to leave Russia, since the new tsar had already been elected. Schujskij could not restore order, and was "humbly" begged by the assembly to vacate the throne, since he was unfortunate in his government and could not enforce any obedience to his rule. He abdicated and became a monk. The council of Boyars now elected Vladislav to be tsar, on the condition that he would accept the Orthodox faith. The Polish troops were already allowed to enter Moscow and commanded the city.

Then the Russian people rose throughout the empire, the monasteries also, with the Troizko-Sergievsk at their head. Nobles, merchants, and peasants banded together to save Russia from the foreign yoke. In Nijni Novgorod many, following the example of a meat-seller, Kusma Minin, sacrificed a third part of their property. The noble prince Posharskij took the lead, and the Poles were soon driven out of Moscow. In the year 1613 the new assembly was convened. The

votes now fell on a step-grandson of Anastasia, wife of Ivan the Terrible, Michael III. Romanof, the fifteen-year-old son of the Metropolitan Philaret, who had gone as ambassador to the Polish king and had been kept prisoner by him in

A New Dynasty for Russia Marienburg. Even in 1610 Michael found himself among the candidates for the throne, and had barely escaped Polish plots. With him a new dynasty mounted the Russian throne.

The state was impoverished and public affairs were in a bad condition. Many towns declared outright that they could pay no taxes. Michael, who had received a monastic education, and was physically weak and of small intellectual endowments,

was not the right man for Russia at this severe crisis. Even his father, Philaret, who really governed in place of his son, possessed no talent as a ruler, while able monarchs were seated on the thrones of Sweden and Poland in the persons of Vladislav and Gustavus II. Adolphus.

Russia thus was forced to endure still longer to be cut off from the Baltic Sea by Poland and Sweden. In the treaties which she made with Sweden at Stolbovo in 1617, with Poland at Deulino in 1618, and then at Poljanovka in 1634, Russia was forced to relinquish all claim on

Livonia, Smolensk, and a series of towns. "Russia now cannot launch a single boat on the Baltic without our consent," said Gustavus Adolphus in the Swedish diet, "and it will be hard for the Russians to leap over this stream." Even against other enemies Russia felt her weakness. When the Cossacks had conquered Turkish Azov, the tsar ordered them to evacuate the fortress. The highest merits of Michael and his father were that they governed without harshness and endeavoured to raise the economic position of Russia. After centuries of oppression from Tartars and tsars the people once more enjoyed more humane treatment. Both rulers held frequent sessions of the



PHILARET: FATHER OF MICHAEL III. The Metropolitan Philaret, who gave the first Romanof to the throne of Russia, really ruled in place of his son, but as he had no governing talents, he accomplished very little.

Russia in Fear of the Foreign Yoke

Privy Council, which had long been in abeyance.

It was only under Michael's son Alexis (1645-1676) and under the children of Alexis, Feodor (1676-1682), Ivan (1682-1689), Sophia, and Peter the Great, that fortune once more smiled on Russia, first in consequence of the weakness of Poland under John Casimir, and then from her own increased strength. The Ukraine then submitted to the tsar; in 1667 Poland in the treaty at Andrussov was obliged to cede the Ukraine, on the left bank of the Dnieper, with Kiev; this was finally ratified in 1686 in the peace of Grzymul-tovskij by Sobieski, when Sophia reigned in the name of her infant brother. Russia also in 1667 recovered Smolensk and other territories, which had been the cause of wars for centuries. Peter the Great first began the war with Sweden on account of Livonia. It was still more important for Russia that with the Romanofs Tartar Russia ceased, and its Europeanising began.

The Tartar supremacy was the greatest calamity that befell the Russian state in its entire historical development, not merely because it lost political independence for nearly 300 years, and was treated with barbarity and became impoverished, but, in a still higher degree, because the people were nearly 500 years behind Western Europe in the progress of civilisation. A despotic government, which treated its subjects like Asiatics, a taxation which emptied the pockets of the people, a brutalisation of habits, a growth of servility among the population, and, as a consequence, a disparagement and even a contempt for culture, an Asiatic arrogance, and a tendency to aloofness from the West European world—all this was the fruit of the long Tartar thraldom. And can any one assert that even now Russia has entirely outgrown these characteristics? It was only towards the end

The Fruits of Tartar Thraldom of the fifteenth century that more frequent tidings of Russia reached Western Europe. On the other hand, Russia had a keen interest in the West. The Florentine Union might be regarded as the first step towards closer intercourse between East and West. But the reign of Ivan III. in this, as in many other connections, marks a real epoch. Ivan III. made himself famous by his marriage with the house of the Palæologi, and also by the fact that

he finally shook off the Tartar yoke. The Hapsburgs were the first to wish to enter into relations with Russia. Nicholas Popel von Lobkovitz (1486) and George von Thurn appeared there as the envoys of Frederic III. and Maximilian. The Archduke Sigismund of the Tyrol, who died in 1496, sent Michael Snups with the order to learn Russian, and inquire into all the chief points of interest in the country.

Ivan himself instituted embassies to Hungary, Germany and Italy. He asked King Matthias Corvinus to send him skilful miners (1482). He made the same request to the Emperor Frederic III., asking at the same time for an artillerist, a builder, and a silversmith. He summoned painters and architects, goldsmiths and bell founders from Italy; among the engineers the most famous was Aristotele Fioraventi, a Bolognese, who cast cannon and created the first artillery in Russia. An Italian, Giambattista della Volpe, was director of the Mint in Moscow after the year 1469. The Greek diplomatist, Trachaniotes, in the year 1489, conducted negotiations for the marriage of a daughter of Ivan III.

New Route From Europe to India with Maximilian. In 1520 Paolo Centurione, a Genoese merchant, came to Moscow with a papal letter of introduction. He was ostensibly commissioned to find a new route from Europe to India, but undoubtedly received other secret instructions. Important results followed the diplomatic labours of the Austrian ambassador, Siegmund Herberstein, who visited Russia on two occasions (1516-1518 and 1526-1527) and wrote a much read book, "*Rerum moscoviticarum commentarii*," about the results of his investigations. A Carinthian by birth, he knew Slavonic, and could therefore with great facility learn the Russian language and collect news. Nevertheless, he relates many fabulous stories of wonderful human beings and beasts in Russia.

The Venetians and English being excited by the discovery of America, like the Genoese by their merchant Centurione, wished to find a new route through Russia to India. In England, Willoughby and Chancellor, in the reign of King Edward VI. (1553) fitted out an expedition to find the north-east passage to India; Willoughby was lost; Chancellor was driven by a storm to the mouth of the Dwina. Ivan the Terrible received him very graciously



TSAR AND TSARITSA IN NATIONAL COSTUMES
OF THE MIDDLE AGES



RUSSIAN PRINCES IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY DRESSES OF THE GRAND DUKES
THE RICH COSTUMES OF RUSSIA'S ROYALTY

and gave the English merchants special privileges. After that time a brisk trade developed between England and Russia; in fact, an English trading company for Russia was founded, with headquarters at Moscow, and several branches which be-

came a formidable rival of the **England's Trade with Russia** Hansa. Ivan, a friend of the British, was nick-named by the anti-progressive Russians "the English Tsar," and even contemplated the idea of marrying Queen Elizabeth of England. The English merchants soon aimed at monopolising the trade and industries of Russia; they started factories and prepared accurate maps of separate districts. Their trading-agent, Giles Fletcher, wrote in 1591 a detailed account of Russian trade. This first discovery of Russia, as the people of England called Chancellor's journey, brought a rich harvest to the English, and produced a large output of rather valuable literature on Russia.

The Dutch, here, as in many other parts of the world, followed in the footsteps of the English. They, too, equipped several expeditions in order to find the northern passage to China and India, and their trade soon outstripped the English. Isaac Massa, their agent, who made several journeys in Russia and Asia, collected important information, studied cartography, and was the first to bring home trustworthy accounts of Siberia. Hessel Gerritsz, a Dutchman, published in 1641 a map of Russia (the first, by Anton Wied, dates from the year 1542). Even the French and Germans took steps to open commercial relations with Russia.

But the Russian nation, instead of seizing the opportunity and learning as much as possible from the foreigners, offered energetic resistance to foreign influence; only some few persons tried to bring Russia into closer relations with Western Europe. A feud broke out between the conservatives and the party of progress, between darkness and enlightenment, which characterises the inner life of Russia after its emancipation from

the Mongol dominion. It still continues with undiminished force and persistently demands immense sacrifices of blood, wealth, and the most valuable possessions of mankind. The future of Russia depends on the decision she takes to oppose or to encourage progress.

In Russia, as a despotic state, the decision ought, in the first instance, to come from the rulers themselves. But the education which always fettered the Russian tsars to the palace and its environs, and tied them with innumerable formalities, was ill adapted to make clear-sighted, level-headed men of them. The Orthodox Church in her ignorance supported the policy of resistance to Western culture. Such harmless innovations as shaving the beard, bathing on certain days, killing vermin, or wearing European clothes, were, in the eyes of the uneducated clergy, who could hardly read or write, regarded as treachery to their nationality and the Church.

It is, therefore, no mere accident that Boris Godunov, having been brought up far from the court, was the first tsar who could be called an Occidental friend of civilisation. Not only did he invite foreigners to his country, but he sent young men to study in Lübeck, France, and England, founded schools, and wished even to endow a university at Moscow, and for this purpose obtained professors from Germany. He had his children taught by strangers, and ordered a map of Russia to be prepared for his son, which was afterwards used by the Dutchman, Hessel Gerritsz, for his publication.

He was, therefore, compared by foreign nations to Ptolemy or Numa Pompilius. But he roused antagonism in Russia, and representations were made to him through the patriarch. Even Dmitri the Pretender was a friend of culture, and for this reason could not hold his own. Schujskij, a thorough-paced Muscovite, repealed the innovations of Godunov and Dmitri. The first Romanofs were friends of



THE TSAR FEODOR III.

A monarch of kindly disposition, he governed on the same lines as his father, Alexis, an accomplished and cultured ruler and the patron of foreigners. Feodor died in 1682.

THE MONARCHS OF MOSCOW

European culture. Michael summoned scholars to Russia; Arsenius, a Greek, set up a Greek and Latin school in Moscow. A still greater patron of foreigners was Alexis (1645-1676). He was devoted to hawking, although it was forbidden by the Church; he brought foreigners in numbers to Russia, protected them from the hatred of the people, and assigned them a particular quarter in Moscow, which was called the German suburb or Slo-boda. Previous tsars had not even known how to write; we have many letters written by Alexis, a treatise on hawking, and memoirs of the Polish war. It was he who fetched the Little Russian scholars Slavi-necky and Polocky to Moscow and established the first postal communications with the West. He also first established a court theatre. His son Feodor, a monarch of kindly disposition, governed on the same lines. Now at last private individuals and ministers were found who were zealous advocates of West European culture. The enlightened chancellor Alexis, Ordin-Nashtshokin, and the Boyar Matvejev were Westerners; they lived in civilisation, and were students of learning without paying any attention to the prejudices of their countrymen. Vasilij Golizyn, who was minister (1680-1689) and favourite of the regent Sophia, was especially praised and admired by the foreigners. Neuville, the Franco-Polish diplomatist, wrote of him that he was one of the most intellectual, magnificent, and courteous princes of his

time. Even in the bosom of the Church there appeared, under Alexis, a man who ventured to meditate ecclesiastical reforms; this was the Patriarch Nikon. Among other things, he ordered a revision of the service books, into which many errors had

been introduced by copyists. But the success of his efforts was trifling. The emendations of Nikon far from a reform, produced a schism in the Russian Church. The priests refused to accept the revised books, and regarded them as heretical. This schism still estranges from the Russian Church millions of subjects, who embody Old Russia. From the bosom of the Raskolniks came, for example, Pugatchef. After postal communications with Western Europe had been instituted, a Russian wrote: "The foreigners have knocked a hole




THE PATRIARCH NIKON, THE REFORMER

The reforming zeal of the age revealed itself in the bosom of the Church itself, where the Patriarch Nikon attempted to introduce ecclesiastical changes. Among other things, he ordered a revision of the service books, but the success of his efforts was very slight. Reproduced from an old engraving.

between our country and theirs; the post, which possibly is financially advantageous to the tsar, only harms the country. The foreigners know at once whatever takes place in our land."

And yet what would Russia have been without the foreigners? Everything had to be brought in from abroad; architects, engineers, painters, artists, officers, cannon-founders, bell-founders, miners, silver-smiths, goldsmiths, doctors, chemists, actors, teachers, and so on. It was only under the direction of the English, Germans, and Dutch that industries, such as mines, glass manufactories, powder-mills, etc., were started. For all military successes the Russians are thus indebted to the outside world.

PETER THE GREAT STUDIES BRITISH INSTITUTIONS



The one aim of Peter the Great was to advance the interests of his country, and he devoted himself with tremendous energy and enthusiasm to this task. He was a close student of the manners and customs of other nations. During the tsar's residence in London he was taken by Lord Dartmouth to the roof of the House of Lords, where he watched the Second Chamber transacting its business.

EASTERN
EUROPE TO
THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION



RUSSIA
IV

THE FOUNDER OF MODERN RUSSIA

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF PETER THE GREAT

It was the greatest good fortune for Russia that in the long struggle between light and darkness, affecting all the aspects of Russian life, it possessed such a ruler as Peter the Great, the son of Alex's by his second wife—a lady of the house of Naryszkin. Peter, a man of rare gifts, with a marvellous memory and an indomitable will, placed himself most emphatically on the side of the party of culture; he overthrew with a strong but rough hand the enemies of European civilisation and refinement, brought Russia suddenly nearer to Europe, and procured her an honourable place among the great European powers. Like Godonov, he had not been brought up in the stifling atmosphere of the tsar's court, but in the country, since his sister Sophia wished to keep him far from the throne. A rough child of Nature, with keen mother wit, he rode rough-shod over all meaningless tradition, and while thus arousing the horror of his countrymen, he excited the admiration of the outside world. He was the first tsar who left his palace, laid his own hand to every sort of work, travelled widely, and performed the hitherto unprecedented feat of a journey to the West.

Peter became absolute tsar in 1689, after his half-sister Sophia the regent, who had even plotted against his life, had been placed in the convent of the Muscovite Sisters. His brother and co-tsar Ivan V. took no share in the government, but was

Peter's Great Ambition for Russia merely named with Peter in all state documents down to his death on January 29th, 1696.

By the year 1725 Peter with restless energy had accomplished a vast number of works, for the completion of which the Russians, with their natural lethargy, would have otherwise required centuries. One goal shone before him and led his steps; he wished to make Russia great and strong by culture. And since he was not for one moment in doubt that

much must first be learned from Europe, he twice journeyed westward to study, and was always eager to bring his country nearer to the Western nations, and to pave the way for a systematised commerce with them. Just as his plans were diametrically opposed to the views of the Russian conservatives, so his life was an uninter-

The Dark Forces of Old Russia rupted and bitter struggle against Old Russia, against all the dark forces which openly and in secret tried to preserve the old order—in a word, against the past. This explains his enthusiasm for the sea and the navy, which might become the connecting links with Western Europe. Russia was an inland empire, on every side somewhat remote from the sea, and her neighbours jealously watched that she should not set sail on it. This unfavourable geographical position has coloured the whole history of Russia. Condemned by Nature to seclusion, she became in the course of time accustomed to this, and soon regarded it as a natural characteristic. The little country of Greece was formerly indebted to its position on the Mediterranean, the high-road of the world, for its high civilisation, as also was ancient Italy.

For this reason Ivan IV. had already endeavoured to conquer Livonia and win a place on the Baltic. Peter grasped this idea still more clearly and applied himself to the naval question with all the fire of his soul. When he saw the sea for the first time at Archangel, he was as it were inspired. English and Dutch ships came thither by the long and seldom ice-free route past the North Cape. That was, for the time being, the only way to Western Europe, and there was the first opportunity of seeing foreign shipping; Peter was seized by a longing for the sea, like a man who, after long years in a foreign country, is smitten with home-sickness. He learnt shipbuilding, studied naval subjects, associated with mariners, and

formed the plan of journeying to Western Europe in order to gain a complete knowledge of the subject. But he first conquered the Turkish Azov, in 1696, and determined to build a fleet on the corner of the Sea of Azov.

He had been primarily indebted to the technical skill of foreign officers for the capture of the fortress, and this could only confirm him in his intention of going to the West. His victory over the Turks produced an impression in Western Europe and many sovereigns congratulated him. In the year 1697 he started on his first European journey, accompanied by 270 followers. This was an epoch-making event for Russia and for the civilised world, since Russia thus broke with her past and went to sit at the feet of the West, only to assume later one of the first places in the circle of the European powers. It was not so much the magnificence of the Western courts that impressed the royal barbarian as the culture; before that he bowed humbly.

Disguised as a simple member of his suite under the plebeian name of Peter

Michailof, he went into foreign countries, not to enjoy himself, but to learn. He did not yet consider himself worthy to appear in all his state. He had for some time served in his own army as a private, then as a bombardier, later as a captain, and so through the grades, and had submitted to the orders of foreigners. It was only after great victories that he ventured to assume higher commands. He went via Riga to Holland first, and then visited England and Holland again; not France this time, because Louis XIV., as Saint-Simon tells us, dissuaded him in a courteous manner. He wished to see everything everywhere. Holland, with its highly developed navy, especially attracted him. It was an important point for the education of the Russian people, particularly

the nobles, who avoided all manual labour, that he worked there with an axe as a carpenter in order to learn thoroughly the art of shipbuilding.

Peter, on his return home from abroad, tried to utilise what he had learned in as many ways and places as he could. The knowledge that Russia emphatically required access to the sea for her development soon led him into war with Sweden, which, by the possession of Livonia, Esthonia, Ingria, and Finland, could call the Baltic its own. This, the second or true "Northern War" with Charles XII. of Sweden ranks among the most important in European history. Peter's badly armed and ill-trained army confronted the best troops in Europe. But every defeat which he sustained only served him as a lesson. The losses of his enemies grew

larger and larger, until on July 8th, 1709, he crushed them at Poltava. At a banquet afterwards he drank the health of the captured Swedish officers for the lessons they had taught him.

From that day forward he made continuous progress on the Baltic, until at the peace of Nystad (September 10th, 1721),

he obtained Livonia, Esthonia, Ingria, and parts of Finland and Carelia. Sweden thus sank to the position of a second-class or third class power. The maritime problem was solved for Russia; a new era dawned. Peter and Russia were seized with a wild joy. Peter publicly danced upon the table and drank to the health of the cheering mob. He had resolved even before the close of the war to remove the centre of the empire to the Baltic. He, therefore, built after 1703 on the Neva, in the territory conquered from Sweden, a fortress and a new capital which was to bear his name, in order that Russia should not again be driven back from the sea, and that she should not forget the man who had led her to the sea. He



THE WIVES OF PETER THE GREAT

This great monarch was twice married. It was a deep sorrow to him that his first wife, Eudoxia Lopuchin, whom, in 1698, he sent to a convent, did not share his reforming zeal but schemed against him; his second wife, Catharine, succeeded him on the throne and died in 1727.

Russia as
a Maritime
Power

PETER THE GREAT, THE FOUNDER OF MODERN RUSSIA

remembered, as he did so, the ancient times when that coast had been Russian, and the men who had won the first victory over the Swedes. He, therefore, founded the Alexander-Nevskij Order. St. Petersburg, where he felt himself "in a sort of paradise," he modestly called his little window looking on Europe.

This same longing for the sea impelled him to win the shore of the Black Sea. The declaration of hostilities by the sultan, whom Sweden, the Tartars, Stanislaus Lesczynski, and the French had instigated to make war on Russia, was

therefore most welcome to him. Peter already dreamt of marching to "Zarigrad," that is, Constantinople, as once the heroes of old Russia had done, in order to free the Christians of the East—Serbs, Montenegrins, Bulgarians, Greeks, and Wallachians—from the Turkish yoke. He calculated upon a universal rising of the Christians, but his undertaking failed simply because no such rising took place. Surrounded at Husch

on the Pruth by 200,000 Turks and Tartars, he was compelled to surrender Azov on July 23rd, 1711, and destroy his fleet. He took this humiliation deeply to heart. It was reserved for his successors to conquer the northern shore of the Black Sea.

He fought with better fortune against the Persians for the possession of the Caspian Sea, across which the commerce between Europe and Asia was intended to pass. The Russians captured in 1723 Daghestan, Gilan, Mazandaran, with Resht, Asterabad, and Baku. The way was paved for their dominion on the Caspian Sea. With a thorough appreciation of the value of free intercourse, Peter provided

for new high-roads and waterways throughout his empire, and contemplated connecting the Twerza with the Msta, the Dwina and the Don with the Volga, the Caspian Sea with the Black Sea, and both by means of the Volga with the Baltic. He constructed the great Ladoga Canal, which connected the Wolchov with the Neva. Holland was his model in these operations, as Sweden was for road making. The postal system was satisfactorily enlarged under Peter, although German officials were still employed and the postal accounts were for a long time kept

in German. Peter also tried to improve the fairs, of which there were some 1,630.

He concluded commercial treaties with several European states, ordered his Boyars to send their children abroad, and undertook himself, in the year 1716, his second journey to the West, where he devoted his special attention this time to art and science, a proof of the progress he himself had made in culture. He now visited France and took pains to conclude a

commercial treaty and a

closer alliance with Louis XV., and would have been glad to marry his daughter Elizabeth to the heir to the throne. But France only consented to a commercial treaty. Louis XV. married on September 5th, 1725, Maria, daughter of that Stanislaus Lesczynski whom Peter in 1707 had helped to drive from the Polish throne.

Peter also brought foreigners into the country that they might erect workshops there and carry on business. The French started tapestry works and stocking factories on the model of the Gobelins manufactory at Paris, and were famous for their skill in weaving Russian wool,



PETER THE GREAT: CHIEF OF ALL THE ROMANOFFS
Becoming absolute Tsar in 1689, Peter the Great rode rough-shod over all meaningless tradition, and soon procured for Russia an honourable place among the great European Powers. He died in 1725.

as the English were for the preparation of Russian leather. The tsar allowed foreigners to look everywhere for metals. He himself founded factories and commanded the Russian artisans to take instruction from foreigners; thus he sent a number of shoemakers from every town to Moscow to be taught by the English who were working there. He improved the conditions of mining, agriculture and stock-rearing. No aspect of economic development escaped his notice. The prosperity of the empire increased and the economic revival spread. The national revenue increased in fifteen years (1710-1725) from three to ten million roubles. The influence and prestige of Russia were

Russia's Debt to Foreigners

of the line, 800 vessels, and 28,000 sailors, which soon showed its value in war. There were in his army many foreign officers or Russians educated abroad, so that in the end he was able to defeat all his enemies. In this task he was especially supported by his general Patrick Gordon, a Scotsman, his admiral François Lefort, a Genevan—both died in 1699—and James Bruce, a Scotsman, who managed the artillery department. The Russians themselves soon made merry over the old army; Theophan Pososhkof, the peasant scholar and partisan of Peter, compared it to a herd of cattle. The army which Peter created beat the first commanders in Europe.

He devoted not less careful attention



THE PALACE OF ORANIENBAUM, NEAR PETERHOF, BUILT BY PETER THE GREAT IN 1714

immensely widened by the growth of national wealth and intercourse with other countries. The first place among all Russian monarchs is on these grounds most emphatically to be assigned to Peter the Great.

The chief corps in Russia had been, since Ivan the Terrible, the Strelitz. As they had several times revolted against Peter, he dissolved them in 1698, after inflicting a sanguinary punishment for their disloyalty. He now formed new regiments of foot soldiers and dragoons as a standing army, which was raised to 210,000 men and regularly levied. The Cossacks and the wild Eastern tribes supplied an unlimited number of fighting men. Peter created a large force of artillery and a fleet, numbering forty-eight ships

to founding educational institutions, so that Russia might no longer be dependent for her culture on the outside world. He thus set up technical schools, such as a school for accountants, a school for working builders, a naval academy, a school of cartography, and introduced foreign teachers, with whom he had personally much intercourse. His acquaintance with Leibnitz, whom he

An Age of Intellectual Progress

nominated privy councillor with a salary of 1,000 thalers, was important. At the suggestion of Leibnitz he founded the Academy of Sciences, which was intended to have its seat in St. Petersburg (it only came into existence after his death, 1725). Peter also equipped scientific expeditions, as for example to Kamchatka, in order to

AN EARLY APPEARANCE OF THE JEWS IN RUSSIA



Peter the Great was the friend of foreigners, and he is here depicted granting permission to settle in Russia to a deputation of Jews in Moscow. But although this concession was made by Peter, it was not until 1839 that a Jew could be a citizen of the first class in Russia.



RUSSIA IN WINTER: ST. PETERSBURG UNDER SNOW

solve the problem whether Asia is connected with America.

It was not less important for Russia that he brought to his court scholars from Little Russia such as Theophan Prokopovitch and Stefan Javorsky, who had already advised the founding of an academy and now found a useful outlet for their energies in the ecclesiastical domain. But the most important point was that Peter decided no one should be admitted to the service of the state who had not acquired the rudiments of school education and some technical knowledge. Nobles who were unable to read and write were to lose their nobility. Every official was bound to put his children in a national school from their tenth to their fifteenth year; uneducated children of the official class were not allowed to marry unless they had learned a trade. The tsar ordered a number of technical books to be translated into Russian, on which task he himself gave advice to the authors. They were to aim

Tsar Encourages Printing and Science in their translations at reproducing not so much the words as the sense, and were to guard against useless digressions. Peter also reformed the obsolete and unpractical alphabet by devising new forms of letters. Since the art of printing in Russia had made no progress since the sixteenth century, he summoned Dutch printers and set up two printing-presses in Moscow, four in St. Petersburg, one each in Tchernigov,

Novgorod, and other towns. He also was a patron of science. The author Polykarpov received 200 roubles from Peter for the "History of Russia from the Sixteenth Century onwards," which he printed. Peter did much also for geography. He ordered curious bones, peculiar stones, and even inscriptions to be collected, and human

The Founder of Russian Newspapers and animal abortions to be exhibited, while he noticed in the ukase that ignorant people made mysteries of such things and ascribed them usually to diabolic agency. He had the monastic libraries examined and copies made of their archives.

He built hospitals, and sent young persons to study medicine abroad. From January 1st, 1700, he introduced into Russia the Christian chronology—of course according to the Julian calendar, which had become antiquated in the interval but was still tenaciously upheld by most non-Catholics—while hitherto the creation of the world had been taken as the starting-point. He even recognised the value of the public Press, and brought into existence in 1714 the "Petersburg Journal." By such many-sided and far-sighted efforts to advance the civilisation of his country, he more than justified the doctorate which he received from Oxford, and the further honour of being nominated a member of the Academy of Sciences at Paris.

The ancient provincial administration would obviously be affected by this great reorganisation, and all the more so as

the worst abuses prevailed in this domain. Since the officials, as was then the custom almost everywhere, received no salary, but only grants of land, or had to maintain themselves at the expense of the population, they became regular tormentors of the people, whom they could plunder without breaking the law. Such emoluments were called in Russia *Kormlenje*; that is, nourishment or forage. "Wait for your post and grow fat" was the formula for appointment in the days of the old tsars. Peter abolished the *Kormlenje*, in doing which he acted with his usual harshness, if not brutality, and appointed a fixed salary for every office.

In the machinery of administration complete confusion prevailed, since the departments of the individual magistrates were not clearly separated. Peter divided the empire in 1708 into eight,

in 1719 into ten, and later into eleven, governorships, and these finally into forty-three provinces. Each governor had at his side a provincial council elected from the nobles. As central authorities he created in 1718 ten governmental colleges or ministries, on the Danish and Swedish model, for foreign affairs, war, the navy, the treasury, law, the revenue, noble estates, industries, mining and trade. In each college one foreigner was given a position. In 1711 Peter instituted a senate, in the place of the Council of the Boyars, as the supreme court of justice and a supervisory authority; he nominated a Procurator-General as its president, who was to watch over the observance of the laws. He gave the towns self-government and independent jurisdiction, and established at St. Petersburg, to control them all, a chief



PETER THE GREAT ON HORSEBACK

While Peter the Great sought to advance Russia by culture and the arts of peace, he was not unmindful of its position as an empire that depended upon its strength of arms, and he aimed at making it powerful against its enemies.



From the painting by

WILLIAM III. WATCHING PETER THE GREAT WORKING AS A SHIPBUILDER AT DEPTFORD DOCKYARD

141. Macbee, R.A.

When Russia's great ruler saw the sea for the first time, at Archangel, he became inspired with the ambition to make his country a naval power. He visited England to learn shipbuilding, and, adopting the plebeian name of Peter Michailof, he worked with his own hands as a carpenter that he might understand the complete art of constructing ships.



THE CROSS OF DESTINY NEAR POLTAVA

Near the city of Poltava, at the junction of the Poltava and the Verskja rivers, stands the massive cross shown in the illustration. It marks the resting-place of many hundreds of Swedish soldiers, who, under Charles XII., were defeated by the Russians, led by Peter the Great, on July 8th, 1709. The battle at once marks the fall of Sweden's power and the beginning of the rise of modern Russia, for as the one nation retrograded the other made rapid strides forward.

magistrate who was responsible to the senate only, and had to attend to trade and commerce.

The tsar created a body of police and introduced a sort of state inquisition in order to break down the opposition to his reforms. He improved the judicial system partly after the Swedish model, more especially the criminal code, and reformed the system of taxation by substituting a poll-tax for the hearth-tax. He took the severest measures to ensure the public peace, by no means an easy

task when brigandage was so widely prevalent. He prosecuted the corners, built workhouses, infirmaries, and lunatic asylums; he called on all his subjects to inform against thieves, and punished the guilty often with his own hand. In order to raise the tone of honour among the whole body of officials, who were both ignorant and corrupt, he ordered that everyone who entered the public service should become noble. By this expedient, and by the institution of orders, he abolished the privileges of the hereditary nobility.




GENERAL VIEW OF POLTAVA, SHOWING THE FAMOUS BATTLEFIELD

Service and work would for the future ennoble a man. He introduced into the public service fourteen grades, of which the highest were to be attained by merit only, without respect of birth.

He interfered even with family and social life. He would not tolerate face-veils, or litters concealed by curtains. Women were not to live in Asiatic seclusion, but to move about freely in the European fashion. He repealed the old Russian law by which all members of a family had equal rights of inheritance, and introduced the German law of primogeniture, in order that the younger sons should be compelled to look for a livelihood

at court in any other costume; and a tax of from thirty to one hundred roubles was laid upon beards. In short, there was hardly a form of life that Peter would not have gladly reformed, all to raise his people as quickly as possible from the condition of barbarism. But although he esteemed strangers, followed their advice, and wished to Europeanise Russia, he did not do so slavishly, but only adopted useful novelties; he preserved the dignity of the Russian nation and allowed no encroachments by foreigners. Thus he punished severely anyone who propagated Lutheran doctrines; and as far as possible he placed Russians in the leading positions.

He did all this with as much haste as if he wanted to leave nothing for his successors to do, or as if he were afraid that his reforms would be reversed and his Russians brought back to the old barbarism. Nor was this anticipation altogether groundless; for in spite of his iron rule and unparalleled energy, he had his enemies; he had not by any means conquered the darkness. The party



A CANAL DREDGER AT WORK
in trade or in the civil service. But this enactment was repealed under the Empress Anna, since it did not suit Russian conditions. Peter further decreed that serfs should only be sold by families and not separately like heads of cattle. He introduced the social forms and customs of the West, arranging, for example, balls and receptions upon the French model. Indeed, he gave orders that Western dress should be worn, in order, as an English diplomat expressed it, that his people might be transformed both outwardly and inwardly; and to make them entirely European, or, as he himself declared to the Danish Ambassador, Juel, in order to make men out of beasts.


When, having returned from his first European journey, he was respectfully welcomed by the Boyars, he received them graciously, embraced and kissed them, but at the same time remonstrated with them about their dress, cut off with his own hands the beards of Field-Marshal Alexei Schein and others, as well as their long skirts and sleeves, and required that men and women alike should dress like Europeans. No one might appear



LADOGA CANAL, BUILT BY PETER THE GREAT

of Old Russia still lived; they crept away like reptiles when a sunbeam strikes into their lurking place. "Unhappily he stands alone with his dozen workers while millions block the way," wrote the enlightened Pososkof, peasant and merchant at once, in his book on "Poverty and Wealth."

The people, the body of officials, the clergy, the Boyars, and in fact his own relations were dissatisfied with the reforms. When Peter came back in 1698 from his travels, a story was current that it was not the tsar, but a stranger, while the real tsar had been rolled into the sea in a barrel by the Germans. The priests announced the



THE WINTER PALACE



MARBLE PALACE BUILT BY CATHARINE II.



THE ANITCHKOFF PALACE



HERMITAGE, ADJOINING WINTER PALACE



PALACES OF THE NOBLES ON THE FONTANKA CANAL

THE STATELY PALACES OF ST. PETERSBURG

approach of Antichrist, and since, according to a prophecy, Antichrist was to be born in adultery, it was said that Peter's mother, the second wife of Alexis, was the false virgin, the adulteress. Insulting notices were posted on the walls. The clergy were especially dangerous, since, being unpleasantly disturbed in their *dolce*

The Clergy as the Enemies of Progress

far niente by Peter, they thought it their duty to oppose the innovations. The Patriarch of Moscow declared that shaven beards were unworthy of men; a beardless man resembled a beast. European dress was stigmatised as the badge of unchristian views. Foreigners were always in such danger that Peter had to protect them. A physician, Bremburg, was almost murdered because a skeleton had been seen in his possession. Whenever fires broke out, foreigners were not infrequently the victims. On the occasion of the revolt of the Strelitz corps, a massacre of all foreigners had been planned. It was intended to destroy the German quarter and to attempt the life of the tsar. If he had not intervened at the very first with severity and courage, a general revolution would have broken out.

The victories of Azov and Poltava contributed largely to strengthen Peter's government. Nevertheless, he was called upon to suppress numerous risings of the Cossacks and different bands, as well as the rebellions of various individuals. How far the clergy were to blame for these insurrections cannot at this distance of time be ascertained. They even knew how to sow opposition in his family. His sister, his wife Eudoxia Lopuchin, and even his son Alexis, were unfriendly to his reforms and therefore to him.

That was the greatest sorrow to Peter. He sent his wife, in 1698, to a convent, but her cell became the centre of all the machinations against him. He tried vainly to guide his son's steps into another path. Even the threat to exclude him from the throne proved unavailing. While he was on his travels, Alexis fled, in 1717, to the relations of his wife, Charlotte of Brunswick, at Vienna. But Peter sent

secret agents after him. They found him at Sant' Elmo, near Naples. He was induced to return home, and his father sat sternly in judgment over him. He forced Alexis, at a meeting of notables in the Kremlin, to renounce the throne (February 14th, 1718). He then ordered him to be thrown into prison and tortured. The tsarevitch was found dead there on July 7th. Peter the Great, in excess of zeal, had thought himself bound to sacrifice his own son on the altar of his country.

He clearly saw from which side the greatest danger threatened his immense work: it was the Church; and he therefore soon determined to limit the influence of the clergy. On the death of the Patriarch Adrian, the enemy of his reforms, in 1700, he did not again fill the vacant chair, but

nominated Stefan Javorsky as vice-patriarch. In 1721 he definitely abolished the office of Patriarch, and appointed a synod of bishops as the chief ecclesiastical authority, and, as in the case of the senate, he placed at its head a procurator-general, who was often a soldier, to represent the tsar. In the edict which announced this change the tsar stated that "the common people cannot grasp the difference between the highest spiritual and secular power, and imagine that the chief pastor of the Church is a second sovereign, who is the equal, if not the superior of the tsar." He advised

the bishops to avoid display and pride and to forbid men prostrating themselves before them. Every bishop was to set up a school in his palace. Peter also looked into the monastic question, and forbade anyone to enter a convent before the age of thirty. He

ordered the monks to learn a trade. He did not venture to confiscate the monastic revenues, although the monasteries had piled up immense wealth, and were often merely incentives to idleness and vice. He imposed on them, however, the duty of keeping up schools and supporting the destitute. With these exceptions, he interfered little in religious questions, and was thoroughly tolerant to all denominations. It was perhaps mainly from fear of



ADMIRAL LEFORT

Peter the Great was by no means averse to employing foreign officers, many of whom were in the service of Russia. Francois Lefort, admiral of the fleet, was a Genevan.

Peter Tolerant to Religions



BUILDINGS OF THE ADMIRALTY IN THEIR BEAUTIFUL GARDEN



NEVSKY PROSPEKT: THE SPLENDID MAIN THOROUGHFARE OF ST PETERSBURG



SPANNING THE RIVER NEVA: THE NICHOLAS BRIDGE

ST. PETERSBURG, THE MAGNIFICENT CAPITAL OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE

the excessive power of the Church that he retained the despotic form of government, and even wished to strengthen the power of the sovereign. Even Ivan the Terrible had condescended to convene provincial diets; his successors did the same; but Peter refused. His ministers supported him in this. Stefan Javorsky actually wrote a book in which he tried to give a scientific basis to absolutism. Peter did not, however, go so far; for instance, he forbade prostration before him and servile modes of address. But in the question of the royal title he wished to break with tradition, and assumed the style of Emperor of all the Russias. He thus placed himself on an equality with the Roman emperor, since he regarded himself as a successor of the Byzantine Cæsars. He was thus the first sovereign in Europe who no longer acknowledged the Roman idea of world empire. In order that his reforms and those of his heirs might not be exposed to an attack delivered by some crown prince of the Old Russian party, he changed the law of succession in so far that each tsar could nominate his successor.

A more versatile monarch can hardly be imagined. Peter put his hand to everything; almost everything was due to his own initiative. Even if he tried to introduce the civilisation and morality of the West into Russia by force, he never allowed Russia to become dependent on strangers or to be governed by them. He summoned young Russians as well as foreigners to his side. In Peter's eyrie, as Pushkin says, there was a wonderful brood of eaglets: Menschikov, who sprang from a small family, became prince, field-marshal and admiral; Boris Scheremetjef, the first marshal of Russia, renowned for his bravery and uprightness, whose exploits were the theme of folk-songs; the brothers Demetrius and Michael Golizyn, Feodor Golovin, Gavril Golovkin, Jacob Vasily, and Gregor Dolgoruki; the fiery, honest, and shrewd Jagusinsky, solicitor-general of the senate; Boris and Alexander Kurakin (father and son), ambassadors to the European courts; Peter Tolstoi,

a splendid diplomat; Alexis Kurbatof, the treasurer, and others. Even Peter III. of Holstein, the degenerate grandson of Peter the Great, said in his praise that he had reared an enlightened family and furnished the state with able generals and officials.

Peter died on February 8th (January 28th O.S.), 1725, barely fifty-three years old, the greatest of the Romanovs, and one of the greatest monarchs of any nation. Seldom has any man employed his life to more advantage. The new era of Russia begins with him. He filled the country with fresh and vigorous sap, breathed a new spirit into the giant frame of the nation, and rejuvenated the empire. His successors stand on his shoulders. The foreign diplomats were full of wonder at his person. "The tsar towers above every man in his realm," wrote the Danish ambassador; "he is a marvel of wisdom, acuteness, observation, promptness, and strength."

The tsar's own people honoured such services. The senate bestowed on him the title of Great Father of his Country. Yet he had received a very defective and old-fashioned education. The electress, Sophia Charlotte of Brandenburg, after 1701 first queen of Prussia, admirably described him: "He is at once very good and very bad," she wrote; "had he enjoyed a better education he would have been a perfect man." It is obvious that sometimes in his exacting labours he acted over-hastily, and that thus many of his creations appeared clumsy at first; much also that he planned was not carried out, and much proved ephemeral. Documents that have been quite recently published give us a glimpse into the indefatigableness and variety of his labours, and into his capacity for carrying a matter through. The documents for the history of his reign are not yet completely accessible, nor has any exhaustive life of Peter been written owing to the mass of materials. But with the lapse of time his true greatness has been more fully realised. In days of distress his disciples wept at his grave, and folk songs called on him to rise from the tomb.



WHEN WOMEN RULED IN RUSSIA

PETER THE GREAT'S SUCCESSORS AND THE BRILLIANT REIGN OF CATHARINE THE GREAT

IT was a misfortune for the empire that Peter the Great died without having nominated his successor, not merely because a civil war might easily have arisen, but because this insecurity grew into a malady which endured for a whole century, occasioning great dangers to the empire. Almost all the relations of Peter, his second wife, Catharine I., his nieces, his daughters, and his grandsons grasped at the sceptre. After 1598 almost every change of sovereignty from the end of the sixteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth century was effected by a coup d'état; and how many tsars died a natural death?

Peter was followed on the throne by Catharine, a Lithuanian of low origin, chiefly because she had won much credit both with the army and with the official classes by wise bribery of the Grand Vizir in the crisis on the Pruth (1711). She designated Peter II., grandson of Peter, and son of the unfortunate Alexis, as her successor. She died in 1727, and he on February 9th, 1730. The throne was then held by the army, especially by the guards. Thus in 1730 the niece of Peter, the Duchess of Courland, Anna Ivanovna, the second daughter of his brother and co-tsar Ivan, came to the throne, and in 1740 Ivan VI. Antonovitch of Brunswick-Bevern, a grandson of Peter, with his mother, Anna Leopoldovna, as regent. But these latter were deposed in the course of the next years, and Elizabeth, the third daughter (born in 1709, and therefore illegitimate) of Peter, mounted the throne, which she occupied until her death, in 1762. After her, the grandson of Peter the Great by his second daughter, Anne of Holstein-Gothorp, came to the throne as Peter III., but was forced to abdicate after six months, and finally, on July 17th, 1762, was murdered by Alexis Orlov at the country house of Ropsha. His wife,

Sophia of Anhalt-Zerbst, mounted the throne as Catharine II. She was followed in 1796 by her son Paul I., who was assassinated on March 23rd, 1801.

It is remarkable that in the course of the eighteenth century women mostly guided the fates of Russia, while the men could not hold their own, but usually died violent deaths. Peter's sister Catharine I. Sophia had been the first to sit on the throne, at first as regent; she wished to be proclaimed sole ruler. She allowed herself more liberty of movement than her brother Peter would have liked, and in this way paved the way for other women to the throne, hitherto an unprecedented event in Russia. The respect felt for Peter I. was so intense and permanent that his second wife was able to succeed him at once. Catharine I. was the first absolute mistress of Russia. The Raskolniki alone, true to their tradition, refused to swear allegiance to her, and preferred to suffer death.

With the women came also the power of favourites, of whom some, such as Bühren (Biron), the favourite of Anna Ivanovna, behaved defiantly, and treated the whole nation with contempt; some even were desirous of mounting the throne themselves, such as Alexander Menschikov, who immediately, after the death of Catharine I., betrothed his daughter Maria on May 25th, 1727, to the heir to the throne (Peter II.), and wished to marry his son Alexander to the latter's sister; in writing to the young Tsar Peter II., he signed himself "your father," and ordered the members of his family to be inserted in the almanac with those of the imperial family, and the names of his daughters to be recited in the church prayers. Alexis Rasumovsky, who was secretly betrothed to Elizabeth, became count (1744), field-marshal, and master of the hunt; Gregory Orlov,

ennobled in 1762, "the handsomest man in the north," wished to marry Catharine II., and became in 1762 an ancestor of Count Bobrinsky.

It was a shameless state of things. The parties at court were fighting one against the other without regard for the welfare of the nation. If one party

Barbarity at the Royal Court came to the helm, it wreaked its fury recklessly on the outgoing party. The defeated were beheaded; if mercy was shown them from the "inborn goodness" of the tsaritsa, their hands were lopped off, their tongues and ears cut off, their property confiscated, and they were sent to Siberia. Thus a series of able men were killed in barbarous party feuds. The hatred against foreigners was revived, and foreign officers were murdered from "patriotism."

The new constitutional changes were usually due to the favourites; an attempt was made in them to limit the power of the crown in favour of the councillors of the crown. After the death of the last Romanof (1730) the "High Privy Council" resolved to utilise the situation in order to obtain charters for the nobility. The Dolgorukij and Golizyn accordingly offered the crown to the female descendants of Ivan V., who stood further from the throne, in the well-founded anticipation that they would more easily accept terms. Anna Ivanovna actually signed the demands laid before her to the effect that the High Council should consist of eight members; that vacancies should be filled by co-optation, and that the council should be summoned for all imperial affairs, so that without its consent no decision could be taken as to peace and war, nor any new taxes levied; that no offices from the highest downwards might be conferred, nor any crown property alienated without its approbation, nor any member of the nobility punished without its judicial cognisance.

Anna, further, might neither marry nor nominate her successor without the approval of the council. Thus in 1730 the Russian Privy Councillors demanded all at once that which the Polish nobility only obtained in the course of centuries.

Possibly, too, the Swedish Riksråd had supplied them with a model. • But the text of the capitulations which we have quoted shows that the Russians were tyros in such matters. Men would not tolerate too sudden innovations, especially when the body of Boyars and priests was intended to submit to the rule of a few persons.

The Russian nation feared the domination of the high nobility more than the tyranny of the tsar. When, therefore, a few days afterwards, a general assembly of the states was summoned and the capitulation was read out, there was no one, so Bishop Theophan Procopovitch tells us, among those present who did not tremble from head to foot when he heard the document. The members of the Senate and many others presented the empress with petitions against the new constitution, and the officers of the guard cried: "We do not wish that laws shall be dictated to the empress; she ought to have the same rights as her predecessors." Anna, as might be expected, then carried out a coup d'état to secure the crown. Russia was not yet ripe for a more liberal constitution. Despotism, in fact, now struck deeper roots, since it had, as it were, received the sanction of the people.

In other respects the rule of the Russian empresses, with the exception of Catharine II., was thoroughly bad. Apart from the fact that the greatest licentiousness prevailed at the court, and that some empresses, like Catharine I. and Elizabeth, were addicted to drink, they achieved nothing of note by their foreign policy, although they all governed in the spirit of Peter, and were anxious to carry out his plans. Elizabeth, at the advice of her favourite, Ivan Schuvalov, founded the University at Moscow in 1755, and the Academy of Fine Arts at St. Petersburg in 1758. Cyril Rasumovsky wished to establish a university at Baturin in the Ukraine. The learned Privy Councillor Teplof said, with justice, of these foundations: "The Academy is without academicians, the University without students, the rules are not followed; an irremediable



PETER II. OF RUSSIA

Designated by Catharine, the widow of Peter the Great, as her successor on the throne of Russia, Peter II., grandson of the Great, became tsar in 1727. He died in 1730.

Elizabeth the Patron of Education

DECEIVING CATHARINE THE GREAT



It is a remarkable fact that during the eighteenth century the fate of Russia was chiefly in the hands of women rulers. Greatest of these was Catharine II - a woman of striking intellectual gifts - who was desirous at one time to abolish serfdom, and took a deep interest in the condition of her people. During her Majesty's royal progresses it was the custom of her favourite Potemkin to turn up miserable villages into a state of apparent prosperity. Our illustration depicts such a deception.

HARMSWORTH HISTORY OF THE WORLD

confusion prevails everywhere." This confusion was apparent in foreign policy no less than in home affairs. The influence of foreigners now made itself felt in a harsh manner. Under Anna, the German influence was predominant; the Russians were treated with contempt. Anna regarded herself as a foreigner, and ridiculed the Russian nobility and all that was Russian in an unseemly fashion. She chose her court fools by preference from among the Russian nobles; even princesses were compelled to submit to whippings, to crow like hens, sit on nests of eggs, etc.

Under Elizabeth, French fashions were the vogue, and were equally exaggerated. The foreign policy was shaped to suit this movement. The greatest victories, such as that won in conjunction with Laudon in 1759 at Kunersdorf, were not made full use of. Policy was guided by sentiment rather than by regard for the public welfare. Some advantages were obtained against Turkey, but at an excessive price.

At the invitation of the Empress Elizabeth there then came to court Joanna Elizabeth of Anhalt-Zerbst, a princess of Got-torp, connected through Anna Petrovna with the Romanovs, together with her daughter Sophia Augusta Frederica. She succeeded in marrying her daughter to the heir to the throne, Peter Fedorovitch (September 1st, 1745). Sophia had already adopted the Orthodox religion in 1744, and took the name of Catharine Alexejevna; she became afterwards the great empress Catharine II. Herself a beautiful and accomplished woman, of great intellectual powers, she could not

but overshadow her husband, who possessed limited abilities and had been indifferently educated. When she was only fifteen, she read Plato, Cicero, and other classics. She studied later the new French literature, especially the Encyclopædists.

Thus, besides D'Alembert and others, she read and passionately admired Montesquieu, whose writings she "pillaged," and called his "Esprit des Lois," the monarch's breviary. "If I were Pope," she said, "I would canonise him." She kept up a vigorous correspondence with Voltaire: "The ancients would have ranked him among the gods," she wrote of him. She "bought" Diderot's library for 15,000 livres, but on the condition that he managed it for her during the rest of his life at a high salary. She was also familiar

with the literatures of England and Spain. Her gifts and accomplishments were balanced by her licentiousness, in which she surpassed her predecessors. Nevertheless, the fortunes of Russia took a turn for the better when she mounted the throne on July 9th, 1762, having deposed

her husband by force. This able woman soon probed the most complicated questions. It could not, therefore, escape her notice that the future of Russia depended on the establishment of connections with the West. It was a great stroke of good fortune for the Russian nation that in her person a ruler took the

reins of government who, as Peter the Great formerly, in the great struggle between reaction and progress, definitely placed herself on the side of progress. She not only possessed the will to do something for the elevation of culture, but knew how



HUSBAND OF CATHARINE II. Peter III. had been on the throne for only six months when he was forced to abdicate, and on July 17th, 1762, was murdered by Alexis Orlov at the country house of Ropsha.



EMPRESSES ANNA IVANOVNA AND ELIZABETH

The German influence was predominant in Russia during the reign of Anna, who, regarding herself as a foreigner, ridiculed everything that was Russian. French fashions were the vogue under Elizabeth, and the foreign policy was shaped to suit this movement.

THE SUCCESSORS OF PETER THE GREAT

to set the machinery of reform in motion with undeniable skill and intelligence.

Her powerful mind had long contemplated various schemes of reform. She found a coadjutor in the equally intellectual and beautiful Princess Catharine Romanovna Woronzov-Dashkov, the most accomplished woman of her time, who, as she said, was willing to mount the scaffold for her mistress. She did Catharine great service in the deposition of Peter III. The French were the models for Catharine in culture as well as in immorality; but

she did not imitate them to a slavish or vulgar degree. As she always remained a sovereign in her attitude towards her favourites, so she always maintained her dignity among the foreigners from whom she learnt. She knew how to strike the happy mean, and did not go to extremes, as Anna and Elizabeth did, or her husband Peter III., who had deified the Prussian king. Frederic the Great, to an absurd degree. Besides French, she also brought Germans to her court, especially natives of the Baltic provinces,

in which the best schools were to be found. Above all, she allowed the French philosophy of enlightenment to influence her mind. Worshipping the views of the Encyclopædists, she was filled with the lofty thought of making her people happy. She dreamed of no less a scheme than the abolition of serfdom. "Freedom, thou soul of all things," she wrote, "without thee all is dead; I wish to have obedience in laws, but no slaves." Steeped in these ideals, she desired to inaugurate her reign with a modern code. She therefore resolved

to summon a legislative assembly, on the model of the old French estates, from the whole of Russia, and worked for some years with great diligence and acuteness at a draft scheme for its constitution, which testified to her liberal views. She wrote: "The nation is not for the ruler, but the ruler for the nation. The equality of the citizens consists in their only having to obey the law; freedom is the right to do everything that is not forbidden by the law." She condemned religious persecutions and every form of intolerance.

Voltaire expressed his astonishment to her.

Even Frederic the Great could not find words enough to celebrate the authoress, the first woman who came forward as a legislator. The legislative assembly was summoned in the year 1766. It consisted of representatives of all classes and races in the empire, 559 persons. There were to be seen senators, officials, soldiers, members of the synod, citizens, peasants, Tartars, Kalmucks, Lapps, Samoyedes, Germans, and Poles. Every member was

required to be provided with an authorisation from at least five of his electors, and received a medallion bearing the likeness of Catharine and the inscription: "For the happiness of one and all, December 14th, 1766."

All members were declared inviolable for the period of their sittings, and exempt for ever from all corporal punishments. She wrote to Voltaire: "I think that you would be pleased with an assembly in which the Orthodox believer sits between the heretic and the Moslem, all three



ANNA IVANOVNA IN HER ROYAL SPLENDOUR

From a painting in the Romanof Gallery, St. Petersburg.

listen to the speech of an idolator, and then the four of them come to a unanimous opinion." This assembly, owing to its composition, was naturally unfitted for legislative work. In the middle of an earnest discussion over the rights of citizens in towns, one member talked about hygiene, and another recommended a remedy against frost-bite. Nevertheless in the 200 sittings or more which the assembly held, a number of questions were thoroughly discussed, and resolutions were formulated which are of the highest interest.

Owing presumably to the Turkish war, Catharine dissolved the assembly on December 18th, 1768; only the special committees continued in force until December 4th, 1774.

She emphasised, at any rate, in a ukase, the belief that the proceedings had diffused light and learning over the whole realm. The question of the abolition of serfdom had also been touched upon in the assembly; even some nobles among the deputies were in favour of it. Count Peter Scheremetjev, a great benefactor to the poor, and so free from prejudice that he had married a serf, declared his readiness to emancipate them all. But on the whole the Russian nobility were not inclined to release their

"souls"; for that would have meant economic ruin for most of them. Many were full of class prejudices. The poet Alexander Sumarokov expressed their view when he says: "The peasant is as fitted for serfdom as the house dog for the chain or the canary for the cage."

Catharine herself honestly desired the complete, but gradual, abolition of serfdom, and energetically advocated its amelioration. She severely punished persons who were denounced to her for their inhumane treatment of serfs. But the question was very complicated, for serfdom had a political basis. Its beginning lies in the Tartar age, when the Russian petty princes, who were also the chief tax-collectors of the Tartar Khans,

were obliged to raise the Tartar imposts together with their own, and for this object had to introduce a new system of fiscal groups. The increased demands on the army and revenue caused by continual wars compelled the Muscovite grand dukes above all to look for means with which they could enforce the military duties of the nobility and the taxes and services of the peasantry.

A suitable machinery was found in the well-proved system of fiscal groups with common responsibility, so that the government could not touch each separate individual immediately, but only through the body of ratepayers. The same method was applied to the nobility to bring them into touch with military service

by the creation of "districts of nobility," in which an *ocladozik*, elected from amongst the nobles, fixed the amount and value of the military service which each of the "district nobles" had to render. As a reward for the service the prince handed over to the nobles crown lands with the resident peasants, whose numbers constituted the real value of the lands. The nobles naturally could only discharge their obligations to the state if the peasants remained on the soil and cultivated it; if these left their part of the country, the lands which they



CATHARINE THE GREAT IN THE UNIFORM OF THE HUSSARS

deserted had no further value. In order, therefore, that military service might be secured, and the land-tax (plough-tax), and, after Peter the Great, the hearth-tax or poll-tax, might not be diminished, the peasants' right of moving their domicile required to be checked. At first it was only restricted. Feodor Ivanovitch, 1592 and 1597, then Boris Godunov, 1601 and 1602, Schuskij, 1607, and Peter the Great, frequently occupied themselves with this problem. First of all, emigration was rendered difficult; then it was absolutely forbidden, and the "floating element" of the population was permanently riveted to the soil. The power of the lord over his serf thus was strengthened, and the state did not interfere in their mutual relations.

THE SUCCESSORS OF PETER THE GREAT

In the seventeenth century, prison, fetters and neck-irons were to be found in a country house.

This patriarchal jurisdiction was not limited by any legal conditions, except that the death penalty was forbidden. The peasants, however, always endured this burden in the knowledge that their services were rendered directly to the state as payment for the officials performing military and other services; that is, the nobility. But when Peter III. in 1762 released the nobles from the obligation to serve the state, on the grounds that love for the sovereign and zeal for the service of the state were so universal that it no longer appeared necessary to maintain those compulsory measures, a great agitation was roused among the peasants, for they believed that on their side they were released from all obligations to the nobility. A responsive quiver was felt throughout the empire; even the disturbances in the Ukraine of the year 1767-1768, were influenced by it. For the first time the peasants were overcome by mistrust of the nobles, whom they accused of keeping them in slavery in defiance of the tsar's will. This idea came more prominently forward under Alexander II., and has not been entirely dissipated to-day.

Catharine would certainly have lightened the yoke of serfdom. But on the other hand the solution of this question was then far too difficult; on the other hand she had just been diverted from that idea by the barbarism of the empire, and altered her views surprisingly in 1768. Instead of alleviating the lot of the peasants, she extended the prerogatives of the landowners, conceded to them the most extensive jurisdiction, forbade the peasants to impeach their lords, and allowed the lords to send their serfs to Siberia. Catharine, who erased the word *rab* (slave) from the Russian dictionary, reduced to serfdom a million and a half

peasants in Little Russia. The sanguinary revolt of the Ukraine peasants under Gonta and Selisnjak in 1767-1768, just at the time when the abolition of serfdom was being discussed, completely destroyed the tsaritsa's pleasure in reforms, since she was indignant at the cruelties perpetrated there, and she entirely changed her attitude, as the dangerous and sanguinary rebellion of Pugatchef fully occupied her attention.

Although the Russian nobility in the bulk was hardly worth more than the peasantry, yet it helped the state to keep the savage peasantry in check, and might be regarded, therefore, as part of the state machinery. Catharine's liberal notions received a still ruder shock when, in the course of the French Revolution, that very people, for whose welfare and freedom men had written and toiled indefatigably, perpetrated hideous atrocities. Gonta, Selisnjak, and the Jacobins, Umani and the storming of the Bastille, gave her much food for meditation. Her opinion was that the people did not deserve liberty.

Then her reactionary efforts began. She destroyed socialistic books and ordered their authors to be watched and their correspondence opened. She broke off relations with France, banished all

Frenchmen who were supporters of the Revolution, and received the émigrés with open arms. Catharine did not, however, entirely sacrifice her liberal ideas; the peasants were only temporarily in disfavour with her. She gave the nobility a sort of constitution according to districts, to the towns self-government and private jurisdiction, and special privileges to the merchants. The nobility at that period enjoyed her peculiar favour. She thought the king's cause was the nobles' cause; no nobility, no monarch.

Although Catharine would not abolish serfdom, she was at least trying to prepare for its abolition. She saw that the culture of the nation must first be raised before its condition could be ameliorated, and she



THE FAMOUS CATHARINE II. IN HER ROYAL ROBES

threw herself heart and soul into the task of raising the standard of schools and education. In this effort she was much helped by Ivan Betzkoy, who had been educated abroad. Like Peter the Great, she founded schools, academies of science and art, and educational establishments. There was room, for example, for some

Royal Support for Learning and Science

hundreds of well-born girls in the Smolna convent, and the immense educational institute for destitute children roused the admiration of Napoleon I. She commissioned Diderot to prepare a scheme for a system of secondary schools.

But, unlike Peter the Great, she contemplated the education of the masses, and, therefore, set more thoroughly to work. She not only, in 1775, ordered the "colleges of general supervision" in the separate governments to provide for the foundation of schools in every large town, and in 1781 built in Petersburg seven schools containing one class only, which immediately received 486 scholars, but also nominated, in 1782, a special committee for the establishment of national schools. At the head of the commission, it is true, was placed Peter Savadovskij, who, in spite of his learning, was very indolent, but he had efficient scholars at his side, among them the "Illyrian" school-director Theodor von Jankovics sent by the Emperor Joseph II., in 1782, who elaborated a new curriculum and wrote text-books. The Russian Kosodavlef published twenty-eight school-books.

These were modest beginnings; no village school had yet been erected. But the National School Ordinance of August 5th, 1786, made school reform obligatory on the whole of Russia. The French educational system was the empress's ideal in this; the Emperor Joseph, whom she had met at the beginning of July, 1780, in Mohilef, influenced her in this direction, since he, too, was under the spell of the French enlightenment. At the advice

Catharine Founds a Russian Academy

of the Princess Dashkov, Catharine founded in 1783, on the model of the French, a Russian Academy, which was entrusted with the duty of "drawing up rules for orthography, preparing a Russian grammar and prosody, and encouraging the study of Russian history." The Russian Academy stood, therefore, independently by the side of the Academy of Sciences, whose director was also the princess,

from 1783-1796; the former was incorporated in the latter as a second division as recently as 1855. The Russian Academy set about the preparation of a Russian dictionary. The Princess Dashkov edited three letters; the empress composed an appendix to the first volume. Both academies performed meritorious services in elevating the progress of science in Russia.

Catharine's literary activity had many phases. When Princess Dashkov, in 1783-1785, published "The Companion" (or "Conversational Guide for Friends of Russian Literature"), the empress composed for it some anonymous sketches of a satirical character. She also wrote treatises, tales, and plays. Thus she glorified in "Oleg" the first campaign of the Russians against Constantinople; her court bandmaster, Giuseppe Sarti, composed choruses for this piece. In the piece called "Gorebogatyry," or the "Hero of Misfortunes," she ridiculed Gustavus III. of Sweden. Other works from her pen are "The Siberian Shamans," "Deceivers," "The Blinded," "Woe for the Times." For her grandsons Alexander and Constantine she wrote "The Grandmother's Alphabet," and "The Library," which was printed in Berlin. She collected linguistic notes, spent time on archæology and mythology, and extracted chronicles. She was fond of history, especially Russian. "No history supplies better and greater men than ours; I love it to infatuation," she wrote to Diderot.

An imperishable monument of her genius is to be found in her numerous letters, which testify to her grace, her good breeding, her great intellect and literary talent, as well as to her sparkling wit and sensibility. She wrote with equal facility (though, it must be owned, with equal incorrectness) in Russian, German, and French. Her French letters, according to the opinion of the Abbé Jean Siffrein Maury, surpassed even those of Voltaire. For music alone she had no talent. She commissioned many translators and paid them well, as Peter the Great had formerly done. As a patroness of belles lettres she brought distinguished poets, artists, philosophers, and scholars to her court, at which a high intellectual tone prevailed. Many famous contemporaries visited her there, among them



CATHARINE THE GREAT OF RUSSIA
Mounting the throne in 1762, after deposing Peter III, this remarkable woman did much to raise the standard of education. Liberal and tasteful, she enriched St. Petersburg with works of art and splendid buildings.



Voltaire and Diderot? With Baron Melchior Grimm (1723-1807), she once conversed for seven hours without interruption on scientific questions. He was her art and literary agent in France, and bought for her books, works of art, and collections. Voltaire was her intellectual model. Liberal and tasteful, she adorned and enriched St. Petersburg with works of art and splendid buildings of every sort. She loved brilliance and a luxury hitherto unknown in Russia.

She also patronised the Russian scholars and poets. Even in her day, Russian literature showed a list of famous names; the Russian drama was created at this time. The empress had a great share in rousing the self-consciousness of the nation. Although a German princess by birth, she felt herself a Russian. She said in jest to the physician who opened one of her veins: "That is better; the last drop of German blood is gone." The Russian party might have seen that it was possible to be a reformer and remain a true Russian. A number of Russian newspapers sprang up, and the national literature of Russia now flowed in a broad stream. In short, the culture of East Europe rose, at least in the higher circles of society, to heights of which the most sanguine had never dreamed. It was also greatly to the honour of Catharine that she employed the Church in the cause of culture. She completed a step, on which Peter the Great did not venture, namely, the confiscation of the estates of the Church. The Russian monasteries were enormously wealthy. They had been spared even by the Tartars, and their property had grown from century to century. The number of their members amounted to more than a million; the convent of Troizko-Sergiev, at Moscow, alone had 120,000. Catharine now appointed a board, which placed all Church estates under one government. The convents received for every male member a rouble and a half; from the surplus, schools, hospitals, and other charitable institutions were to be erected.

Catharine divided the Russian state into districts, in order to improve the administration and facilitate supervision, and thus created forty governments. During her reign large tracts of land were settled, mostly with colonists from the West, among them many Germans. The number of the population of the kingdom rose under her to forty millions, which was due not only to the colonisation and incorporation of various regions, but also to the circumstance that she paid attention to public sanitation, and among other things introduced inoculation for small-pox. She founded many towns, several of which bear her name, constructed, like Peter, canals and roads, and promoted trade and industries.

It was fortunate for Russia that through the advocacy of her great tsaritsa the warming rays of Western culture shone on her longer than formerly under Peter the Great. For the military strength and political influence of Russia grew with the progress of her civilisation. In spite of the great services of Catharine we must not forget that she only built on the foundation which Peter I. had laid. Peter the Great had roused Russia from a secular apathy, and his task was the greater. He did almost everything himself. Catharine worked mainly through her statesmen; her greatest gift was

her knack of gathering splendid men round her. She was aware of this, and just enough to admit it openly and to give the precedence to Peter the Great.


Catharine's favourites were to some extent highly gifted men, to whose suggestion she may have been indebted for many an act ascribed to her own inventive powers. It is perhaps an excuse for Catharine's weaknesses and sensuality that in her days such conduct was universal. But while other sovereigns were taken up with sensuality, she worked indefatigably; from early morning until late into the night she attended to the business of the empire. Her people readily forgave her any failings in view of her services.



POTEMKIN, THE FAVOURITE
The favourites of Catharine were, for the most part, highly gifted men, and in the front rank of her esteem stood Gregory Potemkin. But he was not above deceiving her Majesty on occasion.

GREAT DATES IN THE HISTORY OF EASTERN EUROPE: A.D. 376 TO 1793

A.D.		A.D.	
376	Huns invade Russia	1593	Austro-Turkish war
480	Czech migration to Bohemia and Moravia	1598	Murder of the pseudo-Dmitri in Russia; murder of Feodor I., last of the Ruriks; Moscow patriarchate founded
759	Prague founded	1606	Peace of Vienna
862	Rurik the first of his line at Novgorod	1613	Michael Fedorovitch, first Romanof ruler; Russia becomes Europeanised
864	Moravia Christianised	1617	Treaty of Solbovo and cession of Finland to Sweden
894	Bohemia Christianised	1619	Revolt of Bohemia; Frederick elector palatine elected king of Bohemia
906	Magyars overcome Moravia	1648	Bohemia secured to Austria
907	Oleg invades Greek Empire	1654	Conquest of Poland by Russia and Sweden
941 } 944 }	Igor attacks Byzantium	1660	Poland regains independence
955	Olga of Russia baptised	1667	Treaty of Andrussov and acquisition of Polish territory by Russia
988	Russia under Greek and Christian influence	1668	John Casimir abdicates Poland
992	Christianity introduced into Poland	1671	Cossacks subjugated in Russia
996	Hungarian monarchy founded	1674	John Sobieski reigns in Poland
1041	Henry III. conquers and devastates Bohemia	1675	Turks defeated at Lemberg by John Sobieski
1061	Hungary infested by Poles	1676	Stefan Bathori reigns in Poland
1077	Saint Ladislaus king of Hungary	1683	John Sobieski overcomes the Turks and raises the siege of Vienna
1152	Bela II. king of Hungary	1686	Ofen retaken from Turks
1157	Progress of Silesia	1687	Hungarian crown becomes hereditary
1174	Bela III. brings Greek civilisation into Hungary	1689	Peter the Great absolute ruler in Russia
1187	Premysl Ottokar first king of Bohemia	1696	Conquest of Azov by Russia
1222	Golden Bull of Hungary	1697	Turks defeated at Zenta; Peter the Great travels
1223	Russia invaded by the Golden Horde	1698	He dissolves the Strelitz and forms a fleet
1238	Henry II. extends rule of Silesia	1699	Hungary freed from Turks; peace of Carlowitz
1241	Tartars ravage Hungary; Danes driven back from Russia	1700	Russia defeated at Narva by Charles XII. of Sweden; introduction of Julian Calendar into Russia
1242	Tartar power in Russia	1703	St. Petersburg built for the capital
1274	Ladislaus of Hungary and Rudolf of Hapsburg make league	1704	Stanislaus I. elected at Vienna
1300	Moscow made the capital of Russia	1707	Mazeppa attempts to free the Ukraine
1301	Arpad dynasty in Hungary ends	1709	Swedes defeated at Poltava
1309	Charles Robert of Anjou elected king of Hungary	1711	Defeat of Russians on the Pruth; Russia in- stitutes a senate
1325	Silesia invaded by John of Bohemia	1715	Russian conquests on the Baltic; Finnish territory, Esthonia and Livonia added to Russia
1342	Lewis the Great king of Hungary	1716	Peter the Great's second visit to the West
1344-82	Lewis the Great victorious in Servia, Bulgaria and Dalmatia	1718	Expulsion of the Jesuits from Russia; peace of Passarowitz; death of Peter's son, Alexis
1348	King John, blind king of Bohemia, slain at Crecy	1721	Abolition of patriarchal office in Russia
1370	Lewis of Hungary elected king of Poland	1722	Pragmatic sanction in Austria permitting female succession
1380	Tartar war in Russia	1723	Russian conquests on the Caspian shores
1383	Moscow burned	1725	Death of Peter the Great
1395	Tamerlane invades Russia	1730	Deposition of Peter II. (last of the Romanofs)
1411	Sigismund of Hungary elected emperor of Germany	1737	Austro-Russian war with Turkey
1415	Martyrdom of John Huss	1739	Cession of Servia and Wallachia to Turkey by Peace of Belgrade
1419	Capture of Prague by Ziska, the Hussite leader; Hussite war in Bohemia	1740	Prussia conquers Silesia; Hungary supports Maria Theresa
1437	Bohemia and Hungary united to Austria	1741	War of Austrian succession; Elizabeth, daughter of Peter the Great, reigns in Russia
1442	Hunyadi victorious over the Turks	1757	Prussia defeats Austria at Prague
1444	Ladislaus of Hungary defeated and slain at Varna; Hunyadi regent of Hungary	1762	Catharine II. reigns in Russia
1448	Hunyadi defeated at Kossova by Turks	1763	Frederick of Prussia retains Silesia
1456	Hunyadi defends Belgrade	1764	Murder of Ivan VI., lawful heir of Russia
1462	Ivan III. reigns in Russia	1770	Great pestilence in Poland
1471	Ladislaus, king of Poland, elected to Bohemian throne	1772	First partition of Poland
1478	King of Hungary takes Silesia	1774	Crimea independent; peace of Kainardji
1479	Tartar invasion of Russia repelled by Ivan III.	1775	Cossack rebellion in Russia; peasant revolt in Bohemia
1481	Tartars in Russia crushed	1781	Bohemian edict of toleration
1491	Hungary invaded by Maximilian of Austria	1783	Russia annexes Crimea
1506	Sigismund I. reigns in Poland; war between Russia and Poland	1784	Protestants tolerated in Hungary
1514	Peasant revolt in Hungary	1790	Hungary independent
1516	Louis II. king of Hungary	1791	Peace of Sistova
1526	Hungary invaded by Turks; Ofen captured; Louis II. defeated at Battle of Mohacs; John Zapolya elected king of Hungary	1793	Second partition of Poland
1581	Defeat of Wallachia		
1583	Ivan the Terrible reigns in Russia		
1588	Sigismund II. effects reforms in Poland		
1593	England opens trade with Russia		
1598	Strelitz established in Russia		
1599	Lithuania united to Poland		
1579	Ivan the Terrible of Russia seeks to marry Elizabeth of England		
1601	Hungary devastated by Turks		



SYMBOLS OF RUSSIA'S GREATNESS: CROWNS AND SCEPTRES OF THE NATION'S RULER
 1, Tsar's "globe" as Tsar of Astrakhan. 2, The costliest crown in the world, worn by the Russian Emperor as the Tsar of Novgorod; surmounted by a cross of twelve enormous diamonds. 3, The "globe" which, as Tsar of Kiev, belongs to the Emperor; and, 4, his sceptre as Tsar of Siberia. 5, The Russian crown of Siberia; and, 6, the crown of the kingdom of Kasan. 7, This sceptre, which once belonged to Peter the Great, is wielded by the Tsar as "Emperor and Autocrat of All the Russias." 8, The Tsar's throne as ruler of Vladimir (16th century). 9, Crown used in ceremony of crowning heir to Russian throne. 10, Sceptre as Tsar of Moscow.



RISE OF THE KINGDOM OF RUSSIA ITS RAPID GROWTH IN POWER AND INFLUENCE

WHILE the sum total of the work done by Russia in the domain of culture during her general development was hardly sufficient for her own requirements, her military and political successes were, on the other hand, most important, although purchased by great sacrifices. The Russian people had stubbornly survived the Tartar terrorism, had subdued in the sixteenth century the Tartar khanates of Kosa and Astrakhan, had obtained possession of Siberia, had acquired in the seventeenth century the Ukraine, had conquered under Peter the Great the Baltic coast, the Caspian, and the Sea of Azov, and had carried their arms to Persia.

In the eighteenth century the diplomats of Europe were much occupied by the Turkish or Eastern question as well as with the destiny of Poland. A happy solution of this problem was a vitally important task for Russia. Some few years

**Turkey
A Bone of
Contention** after the great defeat under the walls of Vienna (1683), the victories of Eugene of Savoy had shaken the Turkish power to its foundations. As long as a war against the Porte seemed a dangerous enterprise, Hungary, Austria and Poland had been forced to bear the brunt of it alone; in fact they had been sometimes actually hindered by other powers. But when after 1718 the question of the Turkish succession became one of practical politics, all the powers announced their interest in what they were pleased to call the Eastern question, and thus Turkey has been as great a bone of contention as was Poland at an earlier period. Russia, France and England, who hitherto had taken practically no share in wars with Turkey, now became so susceptible on this very point that they thought they alone had a right to settle the matter.

Russia has been often surprised by events at a moment when she was still too weak to discharge some great task with which she suddenly found herself confronted; but then, after collecting all

her forces, she has often outdistanced her rivals, who had got the start. At the end of the seventeenth century, when Poland and Austria dealt Turkey such heavy blows, Russia was still too unprepared to think of making war upon the sultan. The war which she was compelled to wage for the possession of the Ukraine ended in 1681 with the inglorious peace of Bachtchissarai. Then in 1684 a joint embassy for Austria and Poland appeared in Moscow to induce the tsar to occupy the Crimea, the "right hand of the sultan." In 1686 John Sobieski ceded the Ukraine east of the Dnieper to Moscow, in order to secure its co-operation in his plan.

War against the Turks was then still regarded as a holy war, to which all Christian states ought to feel themselves bound; the fact that the Polish king nevertheless richly rewarded Moscow for its services shows that other motives besides those of the Crusader were brought into play. The Russian court, indeed, promised in that treaty to attack the Crimea; but two expeditions equipped for that purpose were abortive. Even Peter the Great only succeeded in taking Azov at the second attempt (1696). By these campaigns he formally opened the series of Russian wars with Turkey, just as on the west he was the first to gain a firm footing in Poland. When Peter, a year later, started on his European journey, he received congratulations on all sides, even in Poland. In Vienna the Jesuit

**Peter's
Favourite
Scheme** Freiherr von Lüdighausen brought into his sermon the words that "God would give the tsar, as the namesake of St. Peter, the keys to open the Sublime Porte."

But Peter had more important matters to settle first. It was not until after Poltava (1709) that he recurred to that idea. To drive out the Ottomans from Europe in the name of civilisation became a favourite scheme of his; he saw many millions of Christians of his own faith pining under

the Turkish yoke and fixing their hopes on him. He was already thinking of relieving these peoples when he sustained the reverse of 1711. Surrounded on the Pruth, he was compelled to resign Azov and destroy his fleet. Peter did not venture to contemplate a fourth war against Turkey. Austria, meanwhile, was still entangled in the War of the Spanish Succession. The Hapsburgs won, it is true, whole regions by the treaty at Po-sharevatz (1718); but twenty years had hardly passed before most of the fruits of these great efforts and sacrifices were once more lost. Russia filled the place of the now crippled Poland. Soon after the promotion of Russia to the rank of a kingdom (1701), the growing hostility between Brandenburg and Austria had formed the political axis of Central Europe; at the conferences of Vienna in 1720 Frederick William I. was already termed the most dangerous enemy. Hardly any other state than Russia could be taken into consideration as an ally against the house of Hohenzollern. The first alliance between them, therefore, was concluded on August 6th, 1726. The advantage lay on the side of Austria. The Viennese diplomatists cautiously assumed no responsibility towards Turkey except for Russian possessions in Europe, and succeeded in strictly limiting their obligations to their ally, while the latter was pledged in general terms to afford assistance against the house of Brandenburg.

The assistance which Austria voluntarily extended to Russia on the question of the Polish succession was possibly of more value; later, too, the friendly attitude of Austria in Polish matters was highly useful to Russia. France, however, on the one hand avenged herself for the defeat of Lesczynski in the Polish election of 1733 by Augustus III. of Saxony, by declaring war on Austria, and by inciting to rebellion the electors of Mainz, Cologne, Bavaria and the Palatinate, and on the other hand by forcing Turkey into war against Russia. Urged by Austria, Russia in 1736 sent for the first time her armies to the West, and simultaneously, supported by Austria, began a war against the Porte, after she had by a treaty with Persia, given up the conquests of Peter. This common action

**Russia
Becomes a
Kingdom**

**France
At War with
Austria**

is the more noteworthy since from the language of the Russian and Austrian diplomatists in Niemirow it was clearly shown that both countries had Constantinople before their eyes as the ultimate goal. While, however, Russia fought victoriously against France in Poland, and also against Turkey, Austria was beaten on both fields of battle with considerable losses. In the peace of Belgrade of 1739, Charles VI. was forced to give back Belgrade and Orsova, with Servia and Wallachia. Anna Ivanovna, however, won on the Black Sea a strip of country between the Bug and the Dniester. The influence of Austria henceforth steadily declines in the south, while Russian influence rises; the victories of Prince Eugene in the end only benefited Austria's neighbours.

It would seem as if fear of Prussia had crippled all the energies of Austria. The watchword of Austrian diplomacy was necessarily "Freedom from Prussia." A scheme for effecting this was soon prepared; it proposed the partition of Prussia. Sweden and France declared their readiness for it, and Russia was to be the main support. But on May 3rd., 1740, Frederic the Great mounted the throne of Prussia; on October 20th, the Emperor Charles VI. died, and by December Frederic was in possession of Silesia, having stolen a march on his enemies. Austria was defeated in two wars. In their terror, the Austrian diplomatists allied themselves still more closely with Russia in the new treaty of June 2nd, 1746. Attempts were made in every possible way to bring home to Russia the conviction that Prussia was dangerous to both parties. The advantage lay again on the side of Austria; Russia was pledged to send her sixty thousand auxiliaries should the position become critical. And it was only because Frederic had insulted the Empress Elizabeth by a disparaging remark that the latter had on her part a cause for fighting.

Notwithstanding that Russian armies several times defeated the Prussian king, as at Kunersdorf (August 12th, 1759) or his generals, the opinion gained ground in St. Petersburg that Russia was only picking the chestnuts out of the fire for Austria, and that nothing could be accomplished in Polish affairs without Prussia. The court of St. Petersburg was driven

RISE OF THE KINGDOM OF RUSSIA

to this view by the Eastern policy of Austria. In the eighteenth century Austria possessed no statesman of first rank; even the much-lauded Kaunitz really accomplished nothing. Confusion and hollow phrases mark the style of the Austrian memoirs of that age.

Since the Congress of Niemirov and the peace of Belgrade envious glances had been turned on Russia. The mediocre diplomatists of Vienna thought that Russia would help to crush Prussia and rebuild the power of Austria in the West without interfering with Turkey in return. This absence of any definite plan wearied and exasperated the two northern courts. Not to mention Peter II., who was an unqualified admirer of Frederic, even the cool-headed Catharine II. came to an understanding with Frederic as to all the essential questions of the foreign policy of both countries in the "treaty for mutual defence" of April 1764.

France now, as in the year 1736, fanned a flame in the East, since she urged the Porte to a war against Russia with the intention of diverting the latter from Poland. Kaunitz probably had a hand in the matter; he was convinced that Russia was not in a position to offer resistance, and that he would thus cheaply get rid of the danger threatened from that quarter. But the very opposite result followed. Alexander Golizyn with thirty thousand men defeated the Grand Vizir Mohammed Emin with a hundred thousand men in 1769 at Chotin on the Dniester, and occupied Moldavia and Wallachia; Peter Rumjanzov similarly with a few thousand troops defeated a hundred thousand Tartars on the Large, and then with seventeen thousand beat the Grand Vizir himself with a hundred and fifty thousand men on the Kaghul. Vasili Dolgoruki conquered almost the whole Crimea (1771), after Alexis Orlov on July 16th, 1770, had annihilated the Turkish fleet in the channel of Scio. Bessarabia, some part of Bulgaria, and a few islands of the Archipelago were conquered.

The panic at Constantinople knew no bounds. Even in the cabinet of Vienna the greatest bewilderment prevailed. Russia, it was feared, would conquer Turkey single-handed. The Prussians now were acceptable to Kaunitz, who, with the approval of Emperor Joseph II., paved

the way for an understanding with Frederic. He also concluded a secret treaty on July 7th, 1771, with Turkey, which was, however, repudiated by Maria Theresa. But he did not wish definitely to abandon the old alliance with Russia.

Frederic the Great began to feel anxious about the rapid growth of Russian power. A suitable pressure exerted at this fitting opportunity, when the Russian state, on account of Austria, was dependent on the friendly neutrality of Prussia, promised success; after the brilliant victories of the Russians he saw that some enlargement of his empire was a political necessity in order to preserve the balance of power. In Poland alone was there any possibility of acquiring some enclaves, which could be permanently incorporated with the body of the empire.

The Prussian king therefore asserted that he required some parts of it. A complete annexation of Poland, such as Peter I. had contemplated for his son Alexis, was abandoned by Catharine II. who had too great interests at stake in the south, and was compelled to satisfy the claims of her two other neighbours. Prussia made the proposal, Austria took Zips while waiting to arrange matters with the other courts, and Russia put the seal to it. Thus the first partition of Poland was arranged on August 5th, 1772. The lion's share, the rest of Livonia and White Russia (Witebsk, Mstislav, half Polock, and districts on the Dnieper), with 1,800,000 inhabitants fell to Russia.

Russia, after soothing the political conscience of Prussia and Austria, could now, strengthened by Polish territory, follow out her southern aims with greater energy. From this aspect we can understand the arrangement of her favourable treaty with the Porte, concluded on July 21st, 1774, at Kutchuk-Kainardje (near Silistria). Turkey was compelled to recognise the independence of the Tartars in the Kuban country, on the Bug, and in the Crimea. Russia received Azov on the Don, Kinburn on the Dniester, and all fortified places in the Crimea; besides that, the right of sailing in all Turkish waters and the protectorate over all Orthodox Christians in the East were secured to Russia. The severance of the Tartars from Turkey rendered it easier for Russia to subdue them, and the

protectorate over the Orthodox Christians allowed her to interfere at any time in the political affairs of Turkey. By the first stipulation, the loss of the Black Sea for Turkey, and by the second, the loss of the Balkan countries, became nearer possibilities. Catharine would certainly have dictated harder terms had not her

Austria attention been occupied by
Driven Out of the rebellion of Jemeljan
Bavaria Pugatchef (1773-1774; executed January 11th, 1775).

But reasons of foreign policy imposed moderation upon her; the Austrian statesmen, who had themselves brought on the Eastern question, terrified at the unwelcome turn of events, sounded a loud alarm. In defiance of the principle of the inviolability of Turkey laid down by the Viennese cabinet, Austria induced the Porte to cede Bukowina to her in 1774, an act which could only at bottom be acceptable to the Russian statesmen. Austria reaped the fruits of this policy in the War of the Bavarian Succession (1778 to 1779), in which she was driven out of Bavaria by Prussia and Russia. The young monarch, Joseph II. (1780-1790), after receiving these new blows, became wiser than his diplomatists; he sided with his Russian neighbour, since he would not or could not come to terms with Prussia; he guaranteed to Russia her Turkish conquests by the treaty concluded in the autumn of 1782, and confirmed the agreements as to Poland.

Russia meanwhile resolutely pushed on towards her goal. In March, 1779, the Porte was induced to complete the treaty of 1774 by the agreement of Ainali Kavak. In 1783, the Kuban and the Crimea were annexed by Russia, and thus the subjugation of the Turkish Khanates, which Ivan, the Terrible had begun, was completed. Petersburg actually prepared a plan for the partition of Turkey, the

Russia Again "Greek scheme" of September 10th, which Joseph II.
Defeats sanctioned on November
The Turks 13th, 1782. The Greek Empire


was to be restored and the Grand Duke Constantine (born on May 8th, 1770) to be created emperor. The child was given a Greek nurse; he learned Greek, and was surrounded by Greeks. Potemkin's boastful inscription, "Road to Byzantium," belongs to this period. Turkey, in great disquietude, and encouraged by

Great Britain, Sweden (whose help was of little value) and Prussia, took the initiative in declaring war. The Russian commanders, Suvarof, Potemkin, Repnin, supported by Austrian generals, again won brilliant victories over the Turks. In the peace of Jassy (January 9th, 1792) Russia received merely Oczakow and the stretch of coast between the Bug and the Dniester; Russian influence over the Danubian principalities was secured.

This moderation was prescribed by reasons the same as, or similar to, those in the year 1771. Russia urged a further partition of Poland. The latter had after 1772 zealously reformed the educational and fiscal systems, raised the number of her troops to 100,000, and even abolished the liberum veto. The new constitution, which had been laboriously and judiciously elaborated by the Polish diet, was based on patriotic ideas and liberal notions. It was published on May 3rd, 1791, and held out the promise of a better future. If Russia and Prussia did not wish to suffer by this movement, they must nip it in the bud. The official pretext for intervention

Partitions was offered by the guarantee
of which they had given for the
Poland maintenance of the old constitution. In 1772 the powers had appropriated pieces of Poland on political grounds. Then followed in 1793 the second, and in 1795, after the insurrection under Kosciusko, the third, partition of Poland; in the latter Austria again participated, having just then (January 3rd, 1795) come to an understanding with Russia against Prussia. Only these two events properly deserve the name of partitions, since the three courts then actually contemplated erasing Poland from the map of Europe, while in 1772 it had only been a question of ceding several districts. The Polish diet, as in 1772, was compelled in 1793 also to approve the resolutions of the powers and to sign its own death-warrant. While Prussia and Austria, after numerous changes of ownership, took the central districts of old Poland, Cracow (and the old Russian principality of Halicz), Gnesen, Poser, and Polish Prussia, Russia, with the exception of Masovia (Warsaw), only occupied territories once belonging to old Russia. Catharine thus almost completed the "collection of Russia" which Ivan III. had begun.

VLADIMIR MILKOWICZ



THE HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE BALTIC SEA AND THE NATIONS AROUND ITS SHORES

THE Mediterranean and the Baltic in Europe occupy an exceptional position among the secondary seas. The sea which the ancients regarded as placed in the centre of the world, and which they therefore called Mediterranean, displays for our admiration the architects of that civilisation which preceded Columbus, the representatives of an intellectualism which is imposing itself upon the whole of mankind. The Baltic Sea, again, though of smaller extent, and at the present day of no greater importance than any other secondary sea, at one time played a very similar part and exerted no small influence upon a considerable portion of Europe throughout the historical changes which took place in the countries which formed its shores. Hence the Baltic seems to deserve that special treatment which we have already devoted to the Mediterranean. Within the last thirty years the geographical similarity between these two seas has often been pointed out, and with full justification. Both are true inland seas, which may be regarded as deep gulfs extending from the Atlantic Ocean far into the gigantic continental mass of Asia, Europe, and Africa. The Mediterranean is 730,000 square miles in extent, the Baltic but little more than a seventh of that amount, namely, 111,408. The fact becomes highly important when we remember that the Mediterranean, notwithstanding its comparatively narrow area, was the sea of chief importance to the ancient world; in fact, almost the whole of the then known world was concentrated upon the length of its shores. The Baltic has never been able to claim so high a position. It has, indeed, its own cycle of historical progress and national development; but it is only one of many successive cycles, and one, too, considerably more remote. It must, moreover, be admitted that

the history of the Baltic cannot compare in uniformity with that of the Mediterranean, notwithstanding the fact that the smaller size of this sea seemed to favour concentration upon its shores. Only once—during the time of the Roman Empire—has its political uniformity found complete expression; on the other hand, attempts have often been made to unify the Mediterranean, in the colonisation of the Phœnicians and Greeks, in the establishment of the Pax Romana, in the triumphs of Christianity, and the advances of the Arabs—and these were attempts which reached the shores of the Atlantic Ocean.

**When Sweden
Was a
Great Power**

In the case of the Baltic a modern attempt to secure complete political uniformity occurs only once, during the age when Sweden became a great power, though other peoples upon the coast, such as the Danes, Germans, Poles, and Russians, have aimed at the "dominion of the Baltic." Similarly, an economic and commercial uniformity has existed, not only during the prosperity of the Hanseatic League, but also again under the Swedish domination. At the present day it is possible to regard the Baltic as dominated by a German commercial system, as the business of the Russian and Polish interior is largely carried on by German firms; and in modern times Protestantism has retained its ground on every shore. Even St. Petersburg, the cosmopolitan capital, cannot influence this uniformity, as the Russian national spirit is rather repelled by than attracted to the capital on the Neva, and is, moreover, of small commercial influence. In Finland, the Swedish element of the population is largely concerned with commerce over seas, and the coasts overshadow the interior, both in economic progress and in their influence

**German System
Dominating
the Baltic Sea**

upon civilisation as a whole. A material difference exists between the two seas, with regard both to their position and the direction which their civilisation followed. In the Mediterranean, civilisation advanced with comparative rapidity at an early date from east to west, supported as it was by similar geographical conditions on every coast. In

Man Older Than the Baltic Sea the Baltic Sea, in conformity with its position running from south to north, the southern shores are mentioned by history far earlier than the northern, which were opened to Christianity and to European culture only at a later date. Though the geological changes which have characterised the Baltic were of no importance to the history of mankind, we do not mean to imply that man was not a conscious witness of their passage. Man was already living and hunting in Central Germany long before there was any Baltic Sea in the present sense of the word; recent discoveries seem to betoken an even wider distribution of man in the neighbouring districts. However this may be, it is likely that even as antediluvian man did not object to live permanently upon ice and glacier, so his descendants did not hesitate to follow the ice when it finally melted and retreated. Such progress was indeed imposed upon man by the fact that he depended for his hunting upon the fauna of the glacier, which he was obliged to follow until new climatic conditions opened to him a life of greater material convenience and comfort. This, however, must have been a process of such long continuance throughout the district of the retreating glaciers that the Baltic and the North Sea had time to fill their deepest recesses and to assume those general outlines which have since remained practically unchanged. As a matter of fact, certain experts upon the stone age of the north assert that the "kitchen-midden" people are not to be

Traces of Early Inhabitants regarded as the first inhabitants of the shores of the western Baltic, but that the traces of an earlier race can be found which must have been more closely connected with the geological development of Northern Europe than those later architects of the mussel heaps can ever have been. We are therefore justified in saying that man has witnessed the formation of the Baltic. This sounds a great assertion, and seems to secure to this sea an

exceptional position among its sisters. The fact, however, is not so. Long before the connecting straits were broken through, men were living upon the rolling plains of South-eastern England; and even upon the shores of the oceans which go back to a remoter period mankind has witnessed changes which have exerted a deep influence upon the later distribution of humanity. The Baltic for a time certainly remained without influence upon the fate of its earliest settlers, for the momentous step of embarking upon the sea has been taken by humanity without exception at a late and comparatively advanced period of civilisation. If in the case of the Baltic we find it necessary to look back to prehistoric times we are therefore bound to give special reasons for our decision.

The historical importance of the sea is chiefly and most easily obvious to the eye of the spectator in so far as it evokes and consolidates certain anthropological, ethnographical, political, economic, and intellectual conditions, and in so far as its mere existence upon the surface of the earth diminishes the differences between near or remote settlements of mankind. No single one of our **Importance of Large Water Systems** larger water systems has failed to exert some such influence; even in the case of seas so sparsely inhabited as the Arctic Ocean, these results have been attained by centuries of search for the North-east and North-west Passages; in the absolutely uninhabited Antarctic Ocean the search for the "Terra australis incognita" has produced the same results. It may indeed be said that the final influence of these seas upon the formation of our modern territorial and economic relations has been far greater than that of many seas more favourably situated upon the habitable globe, and far deeper, for instance, than the influence of the Baltic, which has, however, a historical character of its own.

The special position of the Baltic is due to a point which falls outside the limits of those general considerations, and which for this reason, and also because its discovery is the work only of very recent years, has been neglected or disregarded by the ordinary historian. In the case of the Baltic, it is possible for us, using prehistoric and early historic discoveries, and utilising the sciences of comparative civilisation and comparative philology, to follow upon the shores of this sea a sharply

THE HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE BALTIC SEA

distinguished group of peoples almost to its birth, and to an earlier age than perhaps anywhere else in the world, with the possible exceptions of Mesopotamia and Egypt. These groups are Indo-Germanic or Indo-Keltic, or whatever other name may be chosen for this great ethnographical unity which in respect of language and civilisation is unmistakably identical, whatever differences may exist among the component members of the race. In the process of retracing these people to those remote times, generally known as prehistoric, there rises before the eyes of the modern historian, who no less than the ethnographer must deal with prehistoric facts, an ethnological unity, the foundations of which remain unshaken at the present day, though many of its numerous portions may require reconstruction.

As soon as the Baltic begins to influence the history of its inhabitants and neighbours, its special position and configuration make their effects felt as plainly as in all later times, notwithstanding the great modern improvements in means of communication. Comparison and contrast with the Mediterranean are immediately suggested. Both seas are unusually secluded from the outer ocean, and advance unusually far into the broad continent of the Old World, and to the common configuration of both seas Europe owes the fact that so many countries have been laid open to communication and well provided with coast line. At a very early period the Mediterranean facilitated contact and amalgamation between different races, and linked together spheres of civilisation which differed ethnographically and intellectually; the Baltic, on the other hand, was but a means of union between neighbours who were little more than tribes of the same race, and therefore stood upon a very similar intellectual plane. The presence of the Finns in the gulfs of Finland and Bothnia became a disturbing influence upon this unity; the Finns, however, were late in entering the circle of the Baltic people, and have, moreover, avoided its rivers more entirely than any branch of the Indo-Germanic family. Apart from the piratical Esthonians and Livonians, who flourished comparatively late and were speedily crushed by the Germans and the Danes, no great maritime movement is discoverable among this

group of nations, who were predestined by their position to work by land rather than by sea.

Thus far the Baltic appears as the counterpart of the Mediterranean, with the difference that its population is more uniform, its position more northerly, and its historical force inferior. This similarity,

Progress of Mediterranean Civilisation however, comes to an end so soon as we turn our gaze upon the economic conditions of the surrounding countries and the influence exerted by the sea upon their composition. The geographical position of the Mediterranean is characterised by the fact that its axis follow the degrees of latitude. In comparison with this axis, all other lines of extent are so short that the northern and southern shores are separated only by a few degrees at any one point. Consequently, the climate and the natural products of the Mediterranean district are everywhere characterised by a certain uniformity; the products of the various Mediterranean countries differ rather in quantity than in kind. The economic importance of the Mediterranean has been more strongly influenced by this uniformity than is commonly supposed; of native products there has been but little fetching or carrying on the Mediterranean; its importance rather consists in the fact that it gathered the products of foreign and often distant countries and distributed them equally over its breadth and other surrounding countries. To the Mediterranean there primarily belongs that unique uniformity of moral and intellectual progress, for which we justifiably employ the term "Mediterranean civilisation."

In the case of the Baltic, these conditions are largely, though not entirely, changed. The shorter axis of the Baltic is that which runs from west to east; none the less the eastern and western extremities of this sea differ remarkably in climate, in conformation, in the conditions of production and distribution. The western extremity is richly articulated, its climate is that of the ocean, and it leads to direct communication with western Europe while the eastern extremity bears the characteristics of the north-east of the European continent. The northern third of the Baltic is characterised by the scanty influence it has exerted upon the history of mankind; on the other hand, the configuration of the remaining two-thirds has resulted

in an influence far greater. Superficially, this configuration appears to have little in common with that of the Mediterranean; but if we disregard the exchange of commercial products, the only point in question before nations became politically active over seas, another similarity between the two seas becomes obvious. The

Varying Degrees of Civilisation Mediterranean at every period has acted as a great collecting basin into which more has flowed from the East than has flowed out; the eyes of the whole antique and mediæval world eagerly directed to this quarter are sufficient evidence of the fact. Eastward the Mediterranean need give but little to receive more.

Westward and northward the contrary was the case. In these directions there were to be found no peoples of a civilisation in some respects higher than that of the Mediterranean, as was the case in Mesopotamia, India, and China; on that side existed only poverty-stricken tribes, which were regarded with scorn, as too far beneath the ideals of civilisation then prevalent. If upon occasion they were deemed worthy of commercial intercourse by no means insignificant, the fact was due merely to practical considerations; in return for staple wares esteemed but little at the centre of civilisation, they gave those products of their Northern homes which were indispensable to satisfy the luxurious wants of the sunny South; these were tin and amber. The general picture therefore appears as follows: From the south-east to the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, and the Syrian passes, came a strong influx of expensive wares indispensable to refined civilisation—silks, aromatic spices, etc.; there is a weaker but well-marked flow of Mediterranean products northward and a vast consumption of such products in the great basin of the Mediterranean itself. The Baltic never had the character of a collecting basin in any

The Baltic as a Line of Passage high degree; it has always been, and remains at the present day, a line of passage. In other respects its circumstances resemble those of the Mediterranean, with the exception that the lines of exit and entrance diverge by some ninety degrees. The North Sea and the strait on which lie Hamburg and Lübeck serve as the line of entrance, as also at times do the three straits leading to the Skagerrak; from this direction the most valuable articles of commerce

have reached the south Baltic, which alone can be regarded as an independent centre of civilisation; this process has continued from neolithic times—in which, as is evidenced by the dolmens and stone burial places, a civilisation connected with ancestor worship extended from the Mediterranean Sea to the western Baltic territories—down to the Hanseatic and modern periods, which have always given and continue to give a larger amount of manufactured articles to these Baltic shores than they receive in the way of raw material. The district of exportation is the whole of the north-east. It is not until later centuries that it can be shown to have assumed this character, which then became strong enough to influence the whole commercial and economic history of central and western Europe. Its importance, however, was secured, not by tin or amber, but by boundless woods which afforded admirable timber for shipbuilding, and vast supplies of corn, which then fed the industrial districts of western Europe, and especially of Flanders. These goods still form

German Tribes in a State of Nature the staple exports of those districts. The chief reason for the fact that the north-east part of the Baltic became of importance to international communication at so late a date is to be found in the slow development which north European civilisation pursued. The original Germanic tribes were for many thousands of years living in a state of nature; they were dependent upon the gifts of nature to a greater extent than almost any uncivilised people in their position. In considering the part played by the Baltic in the development of the settlers upon its shores, it is obviously permissible for these reasons to regard that part, up to a certain date, as coincident with the influence exerted by the sea in general upon the life of primeval humanity.

That influence is wonderfully slight. For the majority of inferior races, it is practically non-existent, and in the case of others it does not extend beyond the occasional practice of shore fishing for purposes of food or beyond coast navigation for a similar object; the sea becomes a means of intercommunication and a modifying influence only for a very small number of peoples living in favourably situated islands or upon broken coasts, such as the Malay Polynesians, the North-

THE HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE BALTIC SEA

west Americans, and Eskimo. Such influence was exerted by the Baltic at the end of the first millennium A.D. only upon the adjacent parts of the extreme west of Europe, where civilisation was more advanced; for the remaining time and over its larger eastern portion, the importance of the Baltic varies, though it never becomes an influence of direct importance to the inhabitants of these shores. As we have already observed we can pursue their history in an unbroken course to the "midden mounds" of the early Neolithic Age. Neither the sea nor its shores were of any great importance to them; no evidence has yet been found to prove the existence of the simplest methods of navigation in those early times.

During the later period of this long era, and above all in the Bronze Age, the case is entirely changed. The distribution of great megalithic buildings shows that during the early period maritime communication was continued with the Mediterranean round the west coasts of Europe. During the Bronze Age, the Hällristningar, the rock carvings in the southern frontier

Scandinavians in the Bronze Age provinces of Norway and Sweden, with their numerous pictures of strongly manned warships, sea-fights, and other warlike enterprises, prove that the old Scandinavians were mariners almost as bold and confident as their successors the Vikings and shared their art of boat-building. In view of this close acquaintanceship with the sea, we cannot be surprised at the uniformity of the civilisation which during the whole metallic age prevailed throughout the coast lands of the southern and central Baltic; navigation proved to be the best means of equalising contrasts and differences in the native civilisation, and also of distributing rapidly and equably throughout the districts those material and intellectual importations which arrived in such number from the South and the Mediterranean.

The close connection between the European North and the Mediterranean South is one of the remarkable facts in the early history of our continent, while its illustration is one of the greatest achievements of northern archæologists. This connection was maintained by the most different routes, from the Adriatic Sea, down the Elbe and the Oder, along Danube, and from the Black Sea

westward through Russia; all these were paths converging directly upon the southern Baltic. These facts cannot be due to chance, and we shall certainly not be wrong in assuming the true cause to exist in the civilising influence of the Baltic itself. This influence was inadequate to create unaided a special and isolated

Talented Northern Peoples civilisation, such as characterises the Mediterranean; the arctic position, the small size, and the sparse population of the Baltic region militated against such a possibility; but when once connection had been made with the more complex civilisation of the south, the talented northern races were fully capable, not only of assimilating foreign importations, but also of adding to them new forms, which in many cases were nobler and more beautiful. Thus the Mediterranean and the Baltic stand connected in the history of the world. From the south, which was itself influenced by the east, civilisation advanced to the north, whereupon the Baltic, though exercising no creative power, continued to disseminate and unify that civilisation.

The connected history of the Baltic begins at a time when the interchange of commercial products was more often effected by force than by peaceful trade. As yet no great political heroes advance into the dawning light of history; we can observe only the representatives of considerable bodies of seafarers, whose ambition sent them forth upon bold voyages in small boats, to plunder foreign coasts. Gradually these piratical raids became more deliberate undertakings for the foundation of settlements and supremacy. The Vikings, the "men of the creeks," founded a kingdom in Russia in the ninth century under the Slavs, and in the tenth wrested Normandy from the Franks; they soon entered the Mediterranean and settled in Italy. They came forth from every part

The Vikings Enter the Mediterranean of Scandinavia, including the islands in Jutland; the Rhos, who founded the kingdom of Novgorod came from Sveoland; others from Norway and Denmark; all were heathen and enemies to the people of European civilisation. They advanced from the Volkhov and Dwina to the Dnieper, thence into the Black Sea and extorted gold and manufactured articles from the Byzantines. They raised their dragon standard on the Volga and spread

the terror of their name to the Caspian Sea. At the same time a peaceful commerce grew up between Upper Asia and Germany by way of Kiev; thus even in England, traces are to be found of a commerce which was largely in the hands of the

How Peaceful Commerce Was Destroyed Arabians; Kufish coins were then current from the Black and Caspian Seas to the shores of the Baltic and to England. This commerce was destroyed by domestic confusion in Russia, by struggle between the Russian princes and also between the Slavic and Finnish tribes.

The Baltic, which sent its amber by various routes to the south, also attracted Oriental wares by other routes. The necessity was soon recognised of effecting a union among the Baltic coast lands. In the eleventh century the Danes first raised the claim of political supremacy over the coasts of the Baltic instead of making their name feared by piratical raids. Gorm the Old was prevented by Henry the Fowler from carrying out similar intentions, and the Mark of Schleswig was secured against Danish influence (934). Canute the Great (1014-1035) appeared capable of gaining that supremacy for his nation; he united England and Norway with Denmark, secured the Mark of Schleswig by an alliance with the Emperor Conrad II., wrested Pomerania from the Polish League, and extended his conquests to Samland. These great successes were to be immortalised by the conversion of this people to Christianity.

If the empire had remained in the hands of the Franconians and southern Germans, the Danish supremacy might have endured for a long period. Fortunately for the future of Germany, a Saxon, Lothar of Supplinburg, was elected emperor in 1125. The Emperor Lothar and after him the great duke, Henry the Lion, recognised the wide danger implied by the Danish advance and began measures of defence. They entered

The Days of Danish Supremacy upon the struggle with their Scandinavian neighbours, in full consciousness of the political importance which the entrance to the Baltic implied to the German nationality. To secure the victory, all that was necessary was to burst through the barrier of Slav peoples which had settled on the shores of the Baltic up to the period of the great migrations and separated the Germans from their harbours.

Concerning Jomsburg, Vineta, and the great Wendish commercial towns, we have only legendary narratives; history must confine itself to the statement that the maritime traffic of the Slavs upon the Baltic in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was of first-rate importance.

From an early period Wisby, in Gothland, was the central point of the Baltic commerce. The old town laws contained the following clause: "Let it be known that as the people of many countries have gathered in Gothland, peace is hereby assured . . . whoever comes to the coast is to enjoy the peace that has been sworn." Soon afterwards a German community was formed in Wisby by the side of the Gothlanders. Shortly after the middle of the twelfth century the Germans crossed into Russia and appeared together with the Goths in Slavonic Novgorod. At the close of the century a German court existed in that town, on the Volkhov.

Together with Novgorod, Polock and Smolensk were in commercial relations with Gothland from an early time, and with the Germans there, communications being carried on by way of the Dwina. In 1201 Riga was founded from Wisby, and this became the second German town on the Baltic; from Lübeck, the first German port, the citizens of the Westphalian towns, Seost, Münster, and Dortmund, travelled to Riga, by way of Gothland, in order to found a German civic community enjoying "the rights of the Germans in Wisby." The connection between Lübeck, Wisby, and Riga formed the chief link in that chain which was joined at a later period by other Wendish and Prussian towns.

The Danes were forced to retreat before these successes. The fall of Henry the Lion in 1181 and the resulting revolt of the Danes under Waldemar I. and Knut VI., as the overlords of the Baltic Wends, proved to be of no permanent importance. It seemed, indeed, that Waldemar II. (1202-1241) might be able to extend and permanently to secure these acquisitions. The Baltic coasts were subjected to Danish supremacy in a wide curve to the south-west, from Gothland to Pomerania. Hence, Waldemar advanced to the island of Ösel at the mouth of the Gulf of Riga in 1206; but the attempts at conquest and at conversion to Christianity were alike failures. He sent forth two bishops

THE HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE BALTIC SEA

to Riga to inquire into the state of affairs, and would have been glad to wrest the town from the Germans. In the year 1210 he appeared in Pomerellen; the duke Mestwyn did homage to him, and he entertained designs upon Smaland. Seven years later, in 1217, Count Albert of Holstein, a vassal of Waldemar, founded a colony in Livonia and would have resumed the attack upon Ösel had he not been hindered by a thaw. In 1219 the king appeared in person, and occupied the Esthonian fortress of Lindanyssa; this was destroyed and the town of Reval was built upon the site. In the next year Waldemar again sailed to Reval. On this occasion he turned his attention to the more southerly Livonia, which had been conquered and converted to Christianity by the Germans. He immediately closed the harbour of Lübeck, to prevent any further increase of the German colony.

The year 1222 marks the zenith of Danish supremacy in the east, and the greater part of Esthonia then did homage to the Danebrog. On May 7th, 1223, the whole of this mighty edifice collapsed. King

Zenith of Danish Supremacy Waldemar II. was taken prisoner in Fünen by his vassal, Count Henry of Schwerin; and Count Albert of Holstein also fell into the hands of the Germans. The harbour of Lübeck was reopened and counter influences made themselves felt throughout the Baltic coasts. Upon his release from imprisonment Waldemar again tried the fortune of war, but by his defeat at Bornhöved on July 22nd, 1227, the dominion of the Baltic was wrested for ever from the Danes. Waldemar surrendered Nordalbingia and the South Baltic coasts. Northern Esthonia was already conquered by the Germans, and its return to the diminished Denmark was only due to the intervention of the Pope in 1238.

About the middle of the fourteenth century a struggle again broke out between the Germans and the Danes for the predominance in the Baltic, and then it was that the union of the Wendish towns first became the great alliance of the Hansa. Under King Eric Menved (1286-1319) Denmark's supremacy had again been extended to the southern shores of the Baltic, though in a short time it was driven back by the German princes. When Waldemar Atterdag ascended the throne of Denmark in 1340, her power began to

rise again. The lost portions of the empire were recovered with the exception of Esthonia, the masters of which were chiefly German knights and citizens. Waldemar sold this province to the Teutonic knights in 1346. The main territories of Denmark were united and the kingdom recovered the power which it had formerly possessed

The Famous Federation of Cologne under Gorm the Old, and appeared a serious menace to the Germans. In order to secure his power permanently Waldemar wrested the most valuable link from the chain of the Hanseatic towns. Wisby, which remained the staple market of Novgorod, and which for a long time rivalled Lübeck, was suddenly captured in 1361 by the Danish king, who had a short time previously recovered Schonen, with the Hanseatic towns of Bitten, Halland, and Blekinge. This event led to a firm alliance between the Hansa and the famous federation of Cologne in 1367; the towns from Flanders to Esthonia were united in a great military confederacy. Princes who were hostile to Denmark joined the League, and the proud Waldemar succumbed to the repeated attacks of the Germans. He abandoned his kingdom, and commissioned the Danish parliament to conclude peace. The towns opened negotiations in 1370 at Stralsund, and secured important commercial and political privileges; the prince concluded negotiations at Stockholm in 1371.

Only now does the Hansa appear as an independent political power on the Baltic; though internal dissensions decreased its efficiency, yet in its dealings with the outer world, under the leadership of Lübeck, it constituted a national power which did not collapse until Poland became supreme in the north. At an earlier period the Hansa had already suffered infringements of their rights. The trading privileges of the German merchants, the maintenance of which they regarded as their special duty, had been disputed upon occasion in the north-west and east; in Scandinavia the union of Kalmar paved the way for a federation of native merchants, while the Prussian towns had introduced Scottish and English traders into the Baltic. But the chief menace to the powers of the federation was the growing force of the Slav nationality. The Teutonic Order in Prussia and Livonia had excluded the Russians and

Poles from the Baltic. In 1402 the knights bought the New Mark, and thus impeded Polish access to the coast of Pomerania; but in 1410 the Poles, in alliance with Asiatic hordes of Tartars, defeated 200 Prussian knights on the battlefield of Tannenberg, and the territory of the Order would have fallen into the hands of the Polish

East Prussia inhabitants of the interior
Becomes a had not the Livonian master,
Polish Fief Conrad of Vitinghove, sent his marshal to Prussia with a strong force, which, with the help of German mercenaries, secured the peace of Thorn. Fifty years later, in 1466, in a second peace of Thorn, West Prussia and Danzig became Polish, while East Prussia was made a Polish fief. The white eagle replaced the black cross, and the Polish flag became important on the Baltic. In the year 1494 the Petershof in Novgorod was destroyed by Russia, which had been united under Ivan III. The Russian traders advanced to the Hanseatic towns of Livonia. The result was jealousy between these towns and the other members of the federation, as the former began to make the inland trade a monopoly of their own.

For another half-century the Slavs on the Livonian coast were held back, but without foreign help "the bulwark of Christianity" was too weak to make permanent headway against the onslaught from the east. Denmark and Sweden were divided by dissension. Gustavus Vasa destroyed the union of the Scandinavian powers, introduced the Reformation into Sweden and Finland, and prepared for the conquest of Esthonia, which was also Protestant, an enterprise concluded by his son, Eric XIV., in 1561. Livonia, however, was left to the Poles, who secured the whole seaboard from Pomerania to Danzig after the retirement of Russia; about the same time, 1562, Courland also came under Polish supremacy. This position

Poland the on the Baltic made Poland the
Principal principal northern power. With
Power strong bases at Cracow, Danzig, and Riga, extending between the Black and the Baltic Seas, Poland played a considerable part in western history, and attained a measure of scientific and artistic reputation, supported by her close connection with Rome and Italy. Sweden and Russia were unable to make head against this great power. The defects of the Polish kingdom,

apart from her internal dissensions, were very well known to her contemporaries. She required a fleet to secure the dominion of the Baltic. In the election capitulations a fleet was demanded from the kings, but the jealousy of the Polish Slachta, which had been long growing, prevented the imposition of the taxes which would have sufficed for so great a task. Adherence to the Catholic reaction against Protestantism, in addition to the want of a fleet, undermined the position of Poland, and in the course of one generation this monarchical republic began to totter to its fall.

When the great European wars of religion broke out, the Swedish Protestant king, Gustavus Adolphus II., invaded Livonia, forced Riga to capitulate in 1621, and defeated the imperial power in Germany in 1631. In another generation it was difficult to conceive that any other power except Sweden had possessed any permanent prestige or influence in the north of the continent.

The Tsar of Russia, Peter the Great, advanced from the east upon the Baltic coast. He wished, as he said, to have at least one window through which the Russians could look out upon Europe. Charles XI. and Charles XII. of Sweden accelerated the fall of their empire by their selfishness and stupidity. The Northern War, which was not inevitable, was badly conducted, and ended in the loss of Stettin with part of Nearer Pomerania in 1720, of Riga with Livonia, and of Reval with Esthonia (in the peace of Nystad, 1721). By his bold foundation of St. Petersburg in 1703 upon Swedish territory, which had not yet been ceded, Peter the Great built a bridge for his nation to the west.

The dominion of the Baltic which Poland and Sweden had attempted to exercise had disappeared after long struggles, and was never secured by Russia. It may indeed be said that the small country of Denmark, through her possession of the entrance to the Baltic and the extent of her maritime commerce, was a greater influence in Baltic navigation than the tsar's kingdom—at any rate, until the Sound tolls were removed in 1857. Since that date, the preponderance of naval force in the Baltic has passed to Germany.

KARL WEULE
JOSEPH GIRGENSOHN

